

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

A JOURNAL OF THE
CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

VOLUME IV
1910

Reprinted 1967 for
Wm. DAWSON & SONS LTD., LONDON
with the permission of
THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS



TH

ASSOCI
W. PET

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

EDITED BY J. P. POSTGATE

ASSOCIATE EDITORS: WM. GARDNER HALE, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO;
W. PETERSON, MCGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL; T. G. TUCKER, UNIVERSITY OF
MELBOURNE; J. W. WHITE, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

VOLUME IV

1910

Reprinted 1967 for
Wm. DAWSON & SONS LTD., LONDON
with the permission of
THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

RBA
1135102

No. 3.

	PAGE
The <i>Carmen Saeculare</i> of Horace and its Performance, June 3 B.C. 17. W.	
WARDE FOWLER	145
Sophoclea: I. Oedipus Tyrannus; II. Trachiniae. ARTHUR PLATT	156
Cicero's <i>Post Reditum</i> and Other Speeches. W. PETERSON	167
Evidence of Greek Religion on the Text and Interpretation of Attic Tragedy.	
LEWIS R. FARNELL	178
Astrology in Dracontius. A. E. HOUSMAN	191
On Ovid <i>Fasti</i> VI. 263 sqq. J. P. POSTGATE	196
On the Meaning of <i>Ploxinum</i> . H. W. GARROD	201
Callimachus <i>Iambi</i> 162-170. ARTHUR PLATT	205
Mr. Agar's <i>Homerica</i> . Reply. T. W. ALLEN	206
<i>Summaries of Periodicals:</i>	
General	209
Numismatics. WARWICK WROTH	216

No. 4.

Lucius of Madaura: A Difficulty in Apuleius. D. S. ROBERTSON	221
The Uses of <i>iv</i> in the Odyssean Books of the <i>Iliad</i> . A. SHEWAN	228
Notes on Diodorus. H. RICHARDS	232
Signor Ferrero or Caesar? T. RICE HOLMES	239
Sophoclea: III. Antigone. ARTHUR PLATT	247
Emendations of Claudian. J. P. POSTGATE	257
Poeseos Saeculi Sexti Fragmenta Quattuor. H. W. GARROD	263
Restorations and Emendations in Livy I—V. R. S. CONWAY AND W. C. F.	
WALTERS	267
The Vatican Codex of Livy's Third Decade and its Signatures. F. W. SHIPLEY	277
Farnell's <i>Cults of the Greek States</i> . A. BERRIEDALE KEITH	282
A New Translation of Horace's <i>Odes</i> . J. P. POSTGATE	286
<i>Summaries of Periodicals:</i>	
General	294
Notice of Editorial Changes	300
INDEX to Vol. IV.	301

	PAGE
W.	
. 145	
. 156	
. 167	
dy.	
. 178	
. 191	
. 196	
. 201	
. 205	
. 206	
. 209	
. 216	
. 221	
. 228	
. 232	
. 239	
. 247	
. 257	
. 263	
F.	
. 267	
LEY	277
. 282	
. 286	
. 294	
. 300	
. 301	

IN ISSU
for the C
Classical A
friends of C
the Associa
Review, and
classical stu
recording th

The C
in 1886, an
was followe
Postgate (in
1906, the p
Mr. David
separate pu
in January,
length, and
and to be
articles and
motive for
made upon
Classical R
original res
to be suffic
any one so
quite differ
reviewers,
the reviews

Profess
the *Classica*

PREFACE

IN issuing the first number of the *Classical Quarterly* published for the Classical Journals Board, we desire on behalf of the Classical Association to offer our hearty thanks to the generous friends of classical studies whose kind and prompt help has enabled the Association to purchase the *Classical Quarterly* and the *Classical Review*, and to arrange for their future conduct in the sole interest of classical study as a whole. We may, perhaps, take the opportunity of recording the different steps by which this result has been achieved.

The *Classical Review* was established by the late Mr. David Nutt in 1886, and first edited by the Rev. Professor Joseph B. Mayor, who was followed successively by Mr. G. E. Marindin and Professor J. P. Postgate (in 1898). At the suggestion of the last-named Editor, in 1906, the present proprietors of the publishing business which bears Mr. David Nutt's name, arranged to divide the *Review* into two separate publications—the *Classical Quarterly*, which was to appear in January, April, July, and October, and to contain articles of greater length, and the *Classical Review*, to appear in the remaining months, and to be concerned chiefly with reviews of books, short original articles and matters of special interest to teachers. A principal motive for the division was in the increasing weight of the claims made upon the Editor by the two different functions of the old *Classical Review*. The task of judging whether papers embodying original research were such as to deserve publication had been found to be sufficiently heavy to occupy a large proportion of the time of any one scholar, and it seemed imperative to separate from it the quite different duties of allotting the notices of new books to suitable reviewers, and securing the punctual production and appearance of the reviews.

Professor Postgate undertook to edit the *Classical Quarterly*, and the *Classical Review* passed into the editorship of Dr W. H. D. Rouse.

The price of the *Classical Review* was thus reduced, and its circulation has been considerably increased; and the circulation of the *Classical Quarterly*, though naturally not so large as that of the undivided *Classical Review*, has nevertheless been very substantial, both in this country and abroad. In the opinion, however, of its proprietor, the margin of profit on the *Classical Quarterly* was not sufficient to warrant his continuing it at his own risk. To prevent its discontinuance the Editors of the two journals agreed to give a pecuniary guarantee for the year 1909, and in order to secure its continuance thereafter they appealed for help to the Council of the Classical Association, and to the Philological Societies of Oxford and Cambridge. The Council of the Classical Association realized that an opportunity had thus arisen for attempting a project which had been mooted as early as 1904—namely, to follow the example of other societies interested in particular subjects¹ by establishing the leading classical journals of the country upon a permanent basis, vesting their ownership in the Association, and entrusting their control to a representative body of classical scholars.

The Council therefore invited the Philological Societies of Oxford and Cambridge to send representatives to a Conference, and the invitation was cordially accepted. The Oxford Philological Society, was represented by Professor F. Haverfield, Professor Gilbert Murray, and Mr. Herbert Richards. The Cambridge Philological Society was represented by Dr. P. Giles, Mr. E. Harrison, and Mr. E. C. Quiggin; the Classical Association by ourselves. Mr. Butcher was appointed Chairman, and Professor Conway Honorary Secretary.

Five meetings were held—the first on June 19th, the last on October 23rd, 1909.

At the first a resolution was unanimously adopted, declaring that it was desirable that journals doing the work of the *Classical Quarterly* and the *Classical Review* should be owned and controlled by a representative body of classical scholars. Inquiries were then addressed to Messrs. David Nutt with a view to ascertaining on what terms that firm would be willing to transfer the copyright of the journals to the Association. Great difficulties were encountered in

¹ We owe especial thanks to Professor Lorrain Smith, F.R.S., of Manchester, whose share in the similar transfer of the *Journal of Pathology* enabled him to give us counsel and encouragement of no small value at critical points.

the negotia-
fixed as rep-
order to cli-
to Messrs.
of the tran-
signature to
addresses of
able and sp-
of solicitors

Meanw-
drawn up b-
issued by
thought like
considered,
Council of
afterwards
Association
terms of the
£100 toward
of nominati-
agreement
bodies to w-

The fir-
five Manag-
F. Haverfie-
way was n-
Oxford PH-
sentative;
attended b-
whom the
requested t-

Mr. Jo-
terms of s-
elsewhere.

Turnin-
hopes for th-
are the pro-
expenditur-
the Council

the negotiation, but it was finally effected, and the price of £300 was fixed as representing the value of the copyrights and goodwill ; and in order to clinch the bargain a payment on account was formally made to Messrs. Nutt in August. Correspondence, however, on the details of the transfer was continued until December 2nd, when Mr. Nutt's signature to a satisfactory deed of transfer, and the list of the names and addresses of the then subscribers, were at length obtained—not without able and spirited help from Messrs. Hudson and Matthews, the firm of solicitors who had acted for us since July.

Meanwhile a scheme for future management had been finally drawn up by the Conference, and an appeal for subscriptions privately issued by its members to friends of classical studies whom they thought likely to be willing to help. The scheme of management was considered, and, with very slight amendments, approved by the Council of the Classical Association on October 30th, and shortly afterwards by the two Philological Societies. The Council of the Association voted a sum of £150 to the purchase fund, and under the terms of the agreement each of the two societies contributed a sum of £100 towards the initial expenses, each receiving in return the right of nominating a representative to the Board of seven Managers. The agreement is subject to a provision enabling any one of the three bodies to withdraw from it on suitable terms including a year's notice.

The first meeting of the Board was held on December 4th. The five Managers nominated by the Classical Association were Professor F. Haverfield, Mr. E. Harrison, and ourselves ; Professor W. Ridgeway was nominated by the Cambridge Philological Society. The Oxford Philological Society had not yet nominated their representative ; but the senior Oxford member of the Conference kindly attended by invitation. At this meeting the existing Editors, with whom the Conference had been in correspondence throughout, were requested to continue their service for the year 1910.

Mr. John Murray was appointed publisher to the Board, and the terms of subscription were also fixed. These have been announced elsewhere.

Turning from the record of the establishment of the Board to its hopes for the future, we think it well to explain that while the journals are the property of the Classical Association, and while, therefore, the expenditure of the Board is subject to annual audit and approval by the Council of the Association, yet its accounts and funds will be kept

distinct from those of the Association. Subject to the liability of the Board to repay, if called upon, the advance of £150 made by the Classical Association, and the other loans enumerated below which were made to it by some friends of the movement on the invitation of the Conference, the funds of the Board will be devoted wholly to the promotion of classical study and research. The Board hopes already to have done something to improve the efficiency of the journals by relieving the Editors of the expense of compiling the various indexes and chronicles of current literature. It further hopes that if the support hitherto accorded to the journals at home and abroad is maintained and increased, it will be in a position next year to offer at least some modest payment to the contributors; and to ask them in return to aid the Board to effect economy by keeping the cost of corrections in proof within the smallest possible limits.

The Board further contemplates appointing two Editors to each of the journals, who, without any hard-and-fast demarcation of functions, shall yet represent more completely than it is possible for a single scholar to do the Greek and the Latin sides of classical study respectively, and in this way to secure the further advantage of a continuous tradition; since, whenever either Editor of either journal retires, he would leave behind him a scholar who had been his colleague, and who in that capacity had become familiar with the work.

The attention of the Board was also directed to the absence of any journal discharging for the study of the antiquities of Rome and ancient Italy, including the Roman antiquities of Britain and the other subject lands of the Roman Empire, the service that has long been rendered to the study of Greek archaeology by the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*. Steps are being taken by the Board, in conjunction with the Council of the Classical Association, to devise a suitable scheme which may enlist all the support likely to be given both by individual friends of the study and by learned bodies; and at the meeting of the Classical Association in London on January 11th, on the motion of Professor Percy Gardner, a Committee was appointed to confer with a Committee of the Hellenic Society upon this and kindred subjects. Should the result of the Conference be to approve the establishment of a journal specifically devoted to Roman antiquity, the Board looks forward with pleasure to enlarging its duties by undertaking to maintain the new periodical.

We desire
gladly conso
meeting, so
Great Britain
to those wh
scholars eng
reader who
attention to
form no par
invites sugg
to increase t
We add
we have to
Association.

LONDON,
MANCHESTER

The Cl
The Ox
The Ca

The Ri
S. H. I
T. Bar
Profess
Profess
A. W.
A. W.
The E
Lord C
Lord C
Profess

We desire to add on behalf of the Board that it is conscious, and gladly conscious, of the duty that falls upon it of representing and meeting, so far as its province allows, the needs of classical study in Great Britain on all its different sides. It desires to render aid alike to those who are teaching classics even in elementary stages, to scholars engaged in the most elaborate research, and to the cultured reader who finds pleasure in devoting some share of his time and attention to following the progress of classical study, though it may form no part of his daily occupations. And the Board cordially invites suggestions from any reader of the journals which may tend to increase their interest and enlarge their use.

We add a list of the subscribers to the purchase-fund, to whom we have to offer the best thanks of the Board and of the Classical Association.

S. H. BUTCHER,

Chairman of the Board and of the Council of the Classical Association.

R. S. CONWAY,

Hon. Treasurer of the Board and a Vice-President of the Classical Association.

J. W. MACKAIL,

Member of the Board and a Vice-President of the Classical Association.

LONDON,
MANCHESTER, } February, 1910.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNALS FUND.

LIST OF SUBSCRIPTIONS AND LOANS.

	£	s.	d.
The Classical Association	150	0	0
The Oxford Philological Society	100	0	0
The Cambridge Philological Society	100	0	0
 The Right Hon. H. H. Asquith, M.P.	2	2	0
S. H. Butcher, Esq., M.P.	20	0	0
T. Baring, Esq.	10	0	0
Professor R. M. Burrows	1	1	0
Professor A. A. Bevan	5	0	0
A. W. Benn, Esq.	1	1	0
A. W. Benn, Esq. (loan)	4	0	0
The Earl of Cromer	10	0	0
Lord Curzon of Kedleston	3	3	0
Lord Collins	10	0	0
Professor B. M. Connal	1	1	0

	£	s.	d.
Professor R. S. Conway	3	0	0
Professor R. S. Conway (loan)	5	0	0
Mr. Vice-Chancellor Dale	2	2	0
Sir Edward Donner, Bart.	5	0	0
Miss C. I. Daniel	1	1	0
Professor Sir S. Dill	1	1	0
The Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Finlay, M.P.	5	5	0
P. Giles, Esq.	3	0	0
P. Giles, Esq. (loan)	5	0	0
The Rev. James Gow	2	2	0
T. A. Godwin, Esq.	1	1	0
The Earl of Halsbury	10	10	0
F. W. Hirst, Esq.	1	1	0
Dr. W. R. Huggard, Davos Platz	2	2	0
Professor J. Harrower	1	1	0
Lord Justice Kennedy	3	3	0
Lord Loreburn	5	0	0
Professor J. W. Mackail	5	0	0
Professor J. W. Mackail (loan)	5	0	0
A. Percival Moore, Esq.	1	1	0
W. L. Newman, Esq.	10	0	0
T. E. Page, Esq.	5	0	0
A. T. Pollard, Esq.	1	1	0
G. H. Pope, Esq.	1	1	0
Sir Walter Phillimore, Bart.	5	0	0
Dr. L. C. Purser	3	3	0
Principal W. Peterson, Montreal	3	3	0
Professor J. S. Reid	2	0	0
H. Richards, Esq. (loan)	10	0	0
H. J. Roby, Esq.	10	0	0
W. G. Rushbrooke, Esq. (loan)	15	0	0
F. E. Smith, Esq., M.P.	2	2	0
Dr. J. P. Steele, Florence	5	0	0
J. Allsebrook Simon, Esq., M.P.	1	1	0
Professor John Williams White, Harvard	5	0	0

THE

iii. 6 sqq.

I have always
 = *swam domin*
 stand alone, a
 mistress in the
 the lady does
 husband may
 I venture
 (cf. Munro, C
 error, and the
 bene quam p
 darling') era
 mouebat,' etc
 -que is consec
 was an error
 hand of B w

vi. 12

'Your practi

I do not find
 convincing,
 INISTAPRAE
 We may kee
 NO. I. VOL

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

JANUARY 1910.

CATULLUS.

NOTES AND CONJECTURES.

iii. 6 sqq.

nam mellitus erat suamque uorat
ipsam tam bene quam puella matrem;
nec sese a gremio illius mouebat, etc.

I have always found it a sore trial of my faith to regard *suam ipsam*, as = *suam dominam*, and can only join *ipsam* with *matrem*. This leaves *suam* to stand alone, as = *suam dominam*. That use is doubtless defensible of a wife or mistress in the case of a lover; but it is hardly possible of a sparrow, to whom the lady does not 'belong' in that relation. That one who is not lover or husband may know *suos* is no proof that he may know *suum* or *suam* alone.

I venture to think that a misleading, but not uncommon, position of *-que* (cf. Munro, *Criticisms and Elucidations*, on lvii. 2) has caused a slight textual error, and that we should read 'nam mellitus *eram* suamque | norat ipsam tam bene quam puella matrem, nec sese,' etc.—i.e. 'nam mellitus (ὄν, or 'the darling') *eramque* suam norat tam bene quam puella ipsam matrem, *neque* sese mouebat,' etc. *Eram suam* is almost a compound word, and the position of *-que* is consequently much less awkward than in e.g. lxxvi. 11. [*Erat* for *eram* was an error almost inevitable in some copy. In Plaut. *Capt.* 243, the first hand of B wrote *erunt* for *erum* without any such excuse.]

vi. 12

'Your practices are well known'

nam { ni ista praeualet nichil tacere (G)
ni ista (O)

I do not find Schmidt's suggestion (*iam tu ista ipse nihil uales tacere*) at all convincing, though the *iam* of Baehrens is clearly right. The meaningless INISTAPRAE or NIISTAPRAE contains—in a confused form—the letters MISTERIA. We may keep *ualet*, and read '*iam mysteria nil ualet tacere*'—i.e. 'nothing can

any longer keep hidden your mysterious practices' (or 'secrets'). The corruption and derangement were as natural as in xii. 13, where G gives *nemo est sinum* for *est mnemosynum*.

xii. 1-3

Marrucine Asine, manu sinistra
non belle uteris in ioco atque uino;
tollis lintea neglegentiorum.

Opinions doubtless differ as to the agreeableness or otherwise of the asyndeton in v. 3. To me it appears peculiarly abrupt, and I would suggest

manu sinistra
non belle uteris, in ioco utque uino
tollis lintea neglegentiorum

—i.e. *ut in ioco uinoque tollis*, etc.

Ibid. 6 sqq.

crede Polioni
fratri, qui tua furta uel talento
mutari uelit: est enim leporum
disertus puer et facetiarum.

It is hard to believe in the genitive with *disertus*. A very bold man might perhaps venture on a genitive form *disertum*, but the error probably lies in *puer*. It is strange that a *puer* should be treated as a better *arbiter leporum ac facetiarum* than a (supposed) elder brother. Moreover, what has a 'boy' to do with paying talents, even hypothetically? We have no proof that the Polio here mentioned is the Asinius Polio of history, and can base no argument upon that assumption. Without the word *puer*, it would be supposed from the context that Polio was the older and wiser as well as the wittier. The proper correction is probably *pater* (i.e. *p̄r* misread as *puer*). The term has nothing to do with the question of age, but *pater leporum* stands on the same footing with *Aureli, pater esuritionum* of xxi. 1, and the *huic semper uitio pater fuisti* of Martial xii. 53, 6 (quoted by Munro at the former place). The expression appears to be colloquial, and to mean one who 'stands for' a certain thing, whether as begetter of it or as the head and representative of its *familia*. Here, though Polio is perhaps the senior rather than the junior, the point is that he 'stands for' good form in wit and humour. He is in such matters what his brother is not, viz. *disertus*.

[After making this emendation, I find from the 'apparatus criticus' of Ellis that it occurs in an ed. of 1481. But I do not know on what arguments it is there based.]

x. 27

† 'mane me,' inquit puellae;
'istud quod modo dixeram me habere,
fugit me ratio,' etc.

Read 'ma
I am!' Cf. PL
etiam Stephan
deus, or the like

xxii. 6

Is not *chartae* g
the *charta*.

Ibid. 9-11

I object to tu (u
person subjun
to read (with t
tum, etc.

xxx. 4

I propose ne
mark. 'Of co

xl. 6-8

I do not see h
and Catullus v

[As no or
for ita eris or
that Catullus
scribes. The

xliv. 21

The situation
(liber). Catul
they are good
tion. Accord
from the ψυχ
chill upon Ser
word is natura
when C. has

Read '*male me!*' = 'confound it!' or 'deuce take me!'—i.e. 'what a stupid I am!' Cf. Plaut. *Stich.* 5, 4, 27: 'bene uos, bene te, bene me, bene nostram etiam Stephanium' (Ov. *Fast.* 2, 637). It is optional to say *male me* (e.g. *habeat deus*, or the like) or *male mei* or *mi* (sit), but the former is the nearer to the text.

xxii. 6

chartae regiae noui libri.

Is not *chartae* genitive? It is hard to see how *libri* can be differentiated from the *charta*.

Ibid. 9-11

haec cum legas tu, bellus ille et urbanus
Suffenus unus caprimulgus aut fossor
rursus uidetur.

I object to *tu* (1) as having no point in itself; (2) because the generic second person subjunctive is not accompanied by *tu*. Since *tū = tum*, it is surely better to read (with two MSS. in the British Museum, 'a d' Ellis) *haec cum legas, tum*, etc.

xxx. 4

†nec facta impia fallacum hominum caelicolis placent.

I propose *ne* (the affirmative), used sarcastically and without the question-mark. 'Of course, . . .'

xl. 6-8

quid uis? qua lubet esse notus optas?
eris, quandoquidem meos amores
cum longa uoluisti †mirmice poena.

I do not see how *amare* should be corrupted into *mirmice*. Rather *mir- = inir-* and Catullus wrote *inire* (sens. obsc.).

[As no one seems to object to *eris*, it is perhaps right, although to use it for *ita eris* or *notus eris* (at *in malam partem*) seems very curt Latin. I suspect that Catullus wrote *furis*, and that F and E were once more confused by scribes. The madness would be that of ignoring the *longa poena*.]

xliv. 21

qui tunc uocat me, cum malum librum legit.

The situation is this. Sestius has written a speech (*oratio*), published as a book (*liber*). Catullus is eager to continue to go to Sestius' dinner-parties, because they are good ones. He is not simply trying to earn one (his first) invitation. Accordingly, to keep in the good graces of Sestius, he reads this book, from the *ψυχρότης* of which he catches a chill. Now he imprecates a similar chill upon Sestius 'who invites me to dinner, when he has . . . a book.' What word is naturally to be supplied? It is not a case of Sestius inviting Catullus when C. has 'read' the book, as if the invitation directly rewarded the reading.

Rather he invites the poet when he has himself *written* a book. Catullus is of course compelled to read it out of civility and with a view to favours to come. To alter to *legi* is a mistake. The tense and person are right, but the word should be *pegit*.

There is perhaps some contempt (at least here) in the sense of *pangere*.

xliv. 8, 9

hoc ut dixit, Amor sinistra, ut ante,
dextra sternuit adprobatione.

Whether we read *dextra* . . . *adprobatione* or *dextram* . . . *adprobationem*, I believe, with Munro, that *ut ante* can have no meaning here, but is due to v. 17. Munro suggests *sinister adstans*. Nearer, I think, is

hoc ut dixit, Amor sinister *amanti* | dextram, etc.

—i.e. 'Love on the left sneezed a (right-hand, i.e.) lucky approval to the lover.' Amor was pleased with the *amans*. The omen from the left is a good omen and Catullus puns on the words (in *dextram*).

lxiii. 68

ego †nec deum ministra et Cybeles famula ferar?

The usual change to *nunc* may be right, but *deum* offers difficulty. It would imply some depreciation of the gods, unless this objection is got over by emphasizing *ministra*.

I would rather suggest *egone aedium ministra*, etc.—(*needium* read as *nec deum*), i.e. 'a temple handmaid.' The plural is contemptuous (not, of course, 'the temple' of Cybele = *aedis*), but 'a servant woman of temples,' a humble position for a former *flos guminasi*.

lxiv. 22-23^a

O nimis optato saeculorum tempore nati
heroes, saluete, deum gens, o bona matrum
progenies, saluete iter. . . .

The loss of the whole line (23^a) from V is most naturally explained by supposing it to have ended with something very similar to the ending of v. 23. The copyist imagined that he had already written the line. That the ending is omitted by *Schol. Veron. Aen. v. 80* most probably indicates that it was not only similar, but very similar indeed, to that of v. 23. A natural suggestion is

heroes, saluete, deum gens, o bona matrum
progenies, saluete iterum, *gens o bona patrum!*

Doubtless *suboles* (or *proles*) *bona patrum* is possible, but the cessation of *Schol. Veron.* after *iter-* is made the more probable if all the letters *-um* were the same as those standing above them, with the exception of *patrum* for *matrum*.

Ibid. 246

In v. 249
sense and con

In v. 254
hiatus. The
words are re
uestis) which
Ariadne is me
are the troop

lxiv. 9 sq

Though it w
would perhap
tuauerna) nor
Nor is te dulc
thought of bo

believing tha
between te a
tua (uerba) lo

lxv. 12

I think s

lxvi. 8-1

Ibid. 246 sqq.

Sic funesta domus ingressus tecta paterna
morte ferox Theseus qualem Minoidi luctum
obtulerat mente immemorem talem ipse recepit.
quae tamen aspectans cedentem maesta carinam
multiplices animo uoluebat saucia curas.
at parte ex alia florens uolitabat Iacchus
cum thiaso Satyrorum et Nysigenis Silenis,
te quaerens, Ariadna, tuoque incensus amore.
†qui tum alacres passim lymphata mente furebant
enhoe bacchantes, etc.

In v. 249 there is some variety of reading (*quae tum prospectans*). Better sense and connexion may be made with

quae interea aspectans . . .

In v. 254, for *qui tum . . .* I suggest *circum . . .*, without assuming any hiatus. The description here is rapid, though not specially abrupt. No more words are required, inasmuch as the description belongs to a picture (on the *uestis*) which the writer observes point by point. In the one part is Theseus; Ariadne is meanwhile seen on the island; *parte ex alia* is Bacchus; around him are the troop of revellers.

lxiv. 9 sq.

adloquar, audiero numquam †tua loquentem,
numquam ego te, uita frater amabilior,
aspiciam posthac.

Though it would be easy to suggest . . . *tua (uerba) loquentis*, the conjecture would perhaps not be very likely, since neither the loss of *uerba* (unless through *tua uerua*) nor the change of *loquentis* (especially the latter) would be very natural. Nor is *te dulce loquentem* probable, though *-lee* might disappear before *lo-*. I had thought of both these, but on the whole I am inclined to prefer

adloquar, audiero numquam *te alterna* loquentem,

believing that loss occurred through the repeated syllable *te*, or a confusion between *te a-* and *-tern a*. Perhaps others may see more probability in my *tua (uerba) loquentis*.

lxv. 12

semper maesta tua carmina morte †tegam.

I think *seram* is a more likely original than *canam*.

lxvi. 8-10

e Beroniceo uertice caesariem
fulgentem clare, quam †multis illa dearum†
leuia protendens brachia pollicitast.

Perhaps *cunctis* (Haupt) might here be corrupted into *multis*, but it is not a corruption one would anticipate; *deorum* (vulg.) should be read, and, for the rest, I would suggest

quam uotis mille deorum.

Of this, *quam uotis* (read as *quāmuotis*) gave *multis* for *muotis*. Considering the exaggerations allowable to the originals of Catullus and customary with himself, there can be no objection to *uotis mille*. The construction *uotis deorum* needs no illustration.

lxvi. 6

dulcis amor †guiclero deuocet aerio

The *guro* of *ω* is manifestly right, but I do not know whether it has been pointed out that the corruption arose through *cyclo* (which Catullus is translating) written as gloss over *guro*, thus

cyclo
guro > gu(ciclo)ro.

lxvi. 15

estne nouis nuptis odio Venus? anne †parentum
frustrantur falsis gaudia lacrimulis?

The nearest word is *patrantum*, which Catullus would not be the less likely to use because it is somewhat direct in meaning. The construction is *frustrantur gaudia patrantum*.

lxvii. 11 sq.

nec peccatum a me quisquam pote dicere quicquam:
verum †tius populi, ianua quippe facit.

Munro's *quippe* is assuredly right for *qui te*, and the sense is doubtless that of Postgate's

verum, is mos populi, . . .

But nearer to *istius* would be

verum ita ius populi,

i.e. 'so goes the verdict of the people,' which *ius dicit* in the case.

lxviii. 5 sqq.

Sed dicam uobis, uos porro dicite multis
milibus et facite haec charta loquatur anus

* * * * *

notescatque magis mortuos atque magis.

Cannot the blank be approximately filled? After v. 9 occurs the corrupt
iocundum cometas florida ut ageret.

We may, if
of the verse

It has at le
at all?

Since a
it is one reas
in the marg
was a verse
after omissio
also appear
that v. 7 spe
out of the ve
those of the
The conditio

Out of t
to lxviii.^a 16
The cause o
fancied he h
same, or pr
20-24 comp
Of cour
it is a guess

Ibid. 11

Postgat
be a little m
and I toget
my mistress
The ne
parties to ea

The los
was underst
(= terram).

We may, if we choose, take this as an accidental repetition, in a corrupt form, of the verse in lxviii.^a 16

iocundum cum aetas florida uer ageret.

It has at least been influenced by that verse. But why its appearance here at all?

Since a verse is missing here, and an irrelevant verse inserted just below, it is one reasonable hypothesis that the omitted verse was subsequently written in the margin and incorporated in the wrong place. We may believe that it was a verse very much like lxviii.^a 16, and that, when it was to be supplied after omission, the similar verse was written instead of the true one. It would also appear reasonable, to judge from v. 8, which refers to fame after death, that v. 7 spoke of fame or pleasure in life. But, to account for the dropping out of the verse in the first instance, it should either end with letters resembling those of the line preceding, or begin with letters like those in the line following. The conditions are, I think, fairly satisfied by the verse

iocundum ut capiat, dum est aetas florida, <munus>.

Out of this, *dum ē etas* is represented by *cometas*. The general resemblance to lxviii.^a 16 caused the substitution of that line when the correction was made. The cause of the loss was that the copyist, having ended the line with *anus*, fancied he had ended the line with *munus*. [That Catullus can repeat the same, or practically the same, verse in different poems is seen from lxviii.^a 20-24 compared with lxviii.^b 51-56.]

Of course, I do not rate this suggestion at more than a guess, but I think it is a guess free from mere arbitrariness.

Ibid. 115 sqq.

Seitis felices et tu simul et tua uita
et domus in qua lusimus et domina,
et qui principio nobis terram dedit aufert.†

Postgate's *domus <illa> in qua* may be right, but perhaps the loss would be a little more natural in 'in *qua <una>*,' where *una* means, not 'my mistress and I together,' but 'we (all—you, your mistress, myself) sported alike, and my mistress also.' The house was shared by the friends in their amours.

The next line I take to be a blessing on the friend who 'introduced' the parties to each other, and this would be expressed by

et qui principio nos nobis tradidit, Afer (or Anser).

The loss of *nos* was easy (less so with the order *nobis nos*), while *tradidit* was understood as *terrā dedit*, or rather, perhaps, *tra-* was confused with *trā* (= *terram*).

c. 5 sq.

quoi faueam potius? Caeli, tibi : nam tua nobis
perspecta texigitur unica amicitia.

Perhaps *perspecta auxiliost* . . .

cx. 3

tu quod promisti mihi quod mentita, inimica's
promisti *o*.

We may keep *mentita* by reading

tu, quod promisti, *es* mihi quod mentita, inimica's.

I.e. tu, quod *es* mentita id quod promisti, etc.

Doubtless *promisti* may be only a natural substitution of the common
form, but it might come from *promisti^{es} mihi*.

cxii.

Multus homo *es*, Naso, neque tecum multus homo
descendit : Naso, multus *es* et pathicus.

descendit is, of course, used in a double sense, one being *sens. obsc.*, but I
do not understand Scaliger's

neque tecum multus homost *qui* | descendit,

nor do I see why the *-st qui* should have disappeared, unless it be through
some accident to the margin. Such assumptions alone would, however,
deprive us of any criterion for restoration beyond the often doubtful criterion
of the sense. I think that there is a play upon the senses of *multus*, and would
suggest that *non* is lost after *homo*—i.e. *neque tecum multus homo non* | descendit
= *neque non multus homo descendit tecum* = plurimi tecum descendunt.

cxiv. 5 sq.

quare concedo sit diues, dum omnia desint :
saltum laudemus, dummodo ipse egeat.

Read

. . . dummodo *ut* ipse egeat,

which differs, of course, from *dummodo egeat*—i.e. 'let us praise the *saltus*,
provided it be on the understanding that . . . ' or 'provided it results in . . . '

cxv. I

Mentula habet †instar triginta iugera prati.

I had first thought of *saturi* as tolerably near the letters, since *iustur* would
be but a 'nice derangement' of *saturi*. But a vocative is very desirable, and as
Postgate finds *uester* sufficiently near in shape, so one might venture on *Vestri*,

I.e. *Mentula habet, Vestri*, . . .

The san

might perha

Tuos mi

plur., might
would be ad

xcv. 3 s

Hatriensis in
existing lin
would occur
be a guess,

No exagger
humorous
I take, of c
quingenta.
reason for t

lxiv. I.

feri uoltus c
would in a
alone, if u
if as accus
extending
it refers to
Keeping th

In v. 16 M
and proba
-quelidiae

The same Vestrius may also occur in lxx. 3, where for

Aemulus iste tuus qui uestrum exercet amorem

might perhaps be read

Aemulus iste tuos qui, *Vestri*, exercet amores.

Tuos might be misconceived as nominative; *Vestri*, first regarded as gen. plur., might become *uestrum*, and, if subsequently regarded as accus., *amores* would be adapted to *amorem*.

xcv. 3 sq.

milia cum interea quingenta Hortensius uno

* * * * *

Hatriensis in uno (Housman) is probably the most satisfactory alteration in the existing line. It seems to be generally agreed that some case of *uersiculi* would occur in the second (the missing) verse. Since any suggestion can only be a guess, I will make no further prefatory apology for guessing

milia cum interea <ad> quingenta Hatriensis in uno

<saepius excudit stans pede uersiculos>.

No exaggeration can be too great in a passage of Catullus which is both humorous and splenetic. The phrase and association of *stans pede in uno* I take, of course, from Horace. The construction is *excudit versiculos ad milia quingenta*. My reason for putting *uersiculos* at the end is that it offers some reason for the loss, -ERSICVLOS standing below -ENSISVNO.

ADDENDA.

lxiv. 14-17

emersere feri candenti e gurgite uoltus

aequoreae monstrum Nereides admirantes

tilla atque alia uidere luce marinas

mortales oculis nudato corpore Nymphas, etc.

feri uoltus cannot be those of the nymphs or Nereids. Schrader's *freti* (which would in any case be unnecessary) does not strike me as probable. *Uoltus* alone, if used as nominative, could hardly be in apposition to *Nereides*; and, if as accusative, we should require more support for a transitive use of *emersere* extending beyond the reflexive (*se*). I think *feri* . . . *uoltus* is sound, but that it refers to other seafolk than the Nereids, e.g. the Tritons, and to sea-monsters. Keeping this line without change, we may, without technical difficulty, read

aequoreae et . . . in the next.

In v. 16 Munro's *illa (quaque alia ?)* . . . has always appeared to me awkward, and probably untrue in thought. As in xxxi. 13 Postgate's *liquidae* for *-quelidiae* is entirely satisfying, so here I should find in *-quealia* the word

liquida; and since *uidere* as a mere error for *uiderunt* is somewhat improbable, I would write the passage thus—

emersere feri candenti e gurgite uoltus,
aequoreae et monstrum Nereides admirantes
ibant, ac liquida uidere in luce marinas
mortales oculis nudato corpore Nymphas.

Fragm. 2

hunc lucum tibi dedico consecroque, Priape,
qua domus tua Lampsacist quaque †Priape.
nam te praecipue in suis urbibus colit ora
Hellespontiacae, etc.

Better, I think, than the insertion of *silua* (for the loss of which it would be hard to account) would be

qua domus tua Lampsacist quaque *propria sedes*.

My theory is that *propriase*-, especially as following *-que*, led the eye to *priape* (after *-que*) in the preceding line. The ending of that line was accordingly written again instead of *propria sedes*.

University of Melbourne.

T. G. TUCKER.

3 Θησέ
Πελοπίδης ἦ
6 ἐξήγε
23 The
(ὡς ἔστιν ἐξ
ἔστιν ὡς, he
27 εἰ μ
'It is diffic
confused.

19 ἡρπ
The an
The S
notice of t
the husban
οἰκτροτέραν
ἀθλίας. π

I ἐπεὶ
ἐπεὶ κ
εἰ and ἐπεὶ
8 δειν
τῇ πόλει.
interchang
Rom. 10.
ἐλάνθaves.
15 τα
The c
19 In
up a demon

¹ For ot
17, 333.

improbable,

t would be

e to priape
accordingly

TUCKER.

ADVERSARIA ON PLUTARCH'S LIVES.¹

THESEUS.

3 Θησέως τὸ μὲν πατρῶον γένος εἰς Ἐρεχθεά . . . ἀνήκει, τῷ δὲ μητρῷφ Πελοπίδης ἦν. More probably, I think, ἀνήκε.

6 ἐξῆγεν αὐτόν. See Solon 29 below.

23 Theseus picked out two young men, whom he completely changed (ὡς ἔστιν ἐξαλλάξαντα κομιδῇ) to pass for girls. ὡς ἔστιν seems unmeaning: ἔστιν ὡς, he changed in a way completely, would do.

27 εἰ μὲν οὖν, ὡς Ἑλλάνικος ἰστόρηκε, . . . περιῆλθον, ἔργον ἔστι πιστεῦσαι. 'It is difficult to believe that,' not 'if.' ὅτι and εἰ, as elsewhere, have been confused.

ROMULUS.

19 ἡρπιάσθημεν <μὲν> ὑπὸ τῶν νῦν ἔχοντων.

The antithesis demands this.

The Sabine women go on to complain that their relatives, after taking no notice of the abduction for some time, are at last trying to tear them from the husbands and children to whom they are now bound by ties of affection, οἰκτροτέραν βοήθειαν ἐκείνης τῆς ἀμελείας καὶ προδοσίας βοηθοῦντες ἡμῖν ταῖς ἀθλείας. πικροτέραν βοήθειαν I could understand, not οἰκτροτέραν.

LYCURGUS.

1 ἐπεὶ καὶ Σιμωνίδης κ.τ.λ.

ἐπεὶ καὶ makes no sense, and should apparently be εἰ γὰρ καί, for though. εἰ and ἐπεὶ are often confused.

8 δεινῆς οὐσῆς ἀνωμαλίας καὶ πολλῶν ἀκτημόνων καὶ ἀπόρων ἐπιφερομένων τῇ πόλει. ἐπιφερομένων is really meaningless. φέρω and τρέφω sometimes get interchanged and ἐπιτρεφόμενων would make very good sense. D. Hal, *Ant. Rom.* 10. 6. 4 illustrates it exactly: ἡλίκον ἄρα τῇ πόλει κακὸν ἐπιτρέφωv ἐλάνθανες.

15 ταῦρον ἐκτίνει μέγαν.

The context points in the clearest way possible to ἐκτίσει.

19 In Lycurgus' well-known rejoinder to the man who wanted him to set up a democracy in the State, σὺ γὰρ πρῶτος ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ σου ποίησον δημοκρατίαν,

¹ For other *adversaria* on the *Lives* see my *Notes on Xenophon and Others*, p. 236=Class. Rev. 17, 333.

it does not seem to have been noticed that *πρώτος* must be wrong. It would mean *do you be the first to set up democracy in your household*. Read *πρότερος*. The two words are often confused, e.g. almost, though not quite, certainly in *Comp. Lycurgus et Numa* 4 *περὶ τί πρῶτον (πρότερον) ἦν σπουδάσαι προσῆκει ἢ παίδων ἐκτροφῇ*; see *Fabius Maximus* 19 below.

20 *καλὸν ἦν τοι . . . φιλοπολίταν καλεῖσθαι*.

The context proves that we want the comparative here too. Read *κάλλιον*. Cf. *Plato Protag.* 360 A, where the same correction has long been adopted.

27 *κατασχηματίζεσθαι ἰόντας πρὸς τὸ καλόν*.

This is one of several passages not yet—as far as I know—corrected, where hiatus has been introduced by a change in the order of Plutarch's words. Read *πρὸς τὸ καλὸν ἰόντας*. In *ἰόντας* I see nothing wrong. [In the *Comp. Lycurg. et Num.* 3 the order should be *αἰσχυνομένη τις ἀτυφία*.]

29 *ὁμωμοκόσι χρῆσεσθαι*, not *χρήσθαι*. Cf. *ὅρκους λαβὼν . . . ἐμμενεῖν καὶ χρήσεσθαι* twenty lines above.

30 *Ἀθηναίους <μέν>*.

NUMA.

1 *Madvig's ἡ φύσει δυνατόν αὐτάρκη γενέσθαι πρὸς ἀρετὴν ἢ βέλτιον* κ.τ.λ. seems certainly right, but it fails to account for the *καί* which follows *δυνατόν* in the MSS. Did not Plutarch write *δυνατόν καὶ <αὐτόν> αὐτάρκη γενέσθαι*, i.e. of himself, without teaching? *αὐτόν* was lost through similarity to the beginning of *αὐτάρκη*.

12 (end) *ταῦτα μὲν ἐν τοῖς περὶ Καμίλλου μᾶλλον ἀκριβοῦται*. Probably *ἡκρίβωται*.

COMP. LYCURGI ET NUMAE.

4 *ἄγεσθαι καὶ συνεπιστρέφεσθαι τοῖς ἡθεσιν*.
τοῖς ἡθεσιν, I think.

SOLON.

8 At the end *ἔχειν* should perhaps be *σχεῖν*.

18 In Solon's famous verse, though the tradition is in favour of the present tense *ἐπ (ἀπ) ἀρκεῖ*, I have sometimes thought that the imperfect may really have been used.

22 Through his own fault the father cannot speak freely to his children: *παρρησίαν αὐτῷ πρὸς τοὺς γεννομένους οὐκ ἀπολέλοιπεν*.

Should it not be *γεννωμένους*? *οἱ γενόμενοι* is not thus used. In *Lycurgus* 14 *τῶν γεννωμένων* is now read for *τῶν γινόμενων*. Cf. *v.l. Laws* 791 E.

24 Something is missing after *τὸ μὲν ἐνθύμημα* κ.τ.λ.

29 *ἀρχομένων δὲ τῶν περὶ Θέσπιν ἤδη τὴν τραγωδίαν κινεῖν, καὶ διὰ τὴν καινότητα τοὺς πολλοὺς ἀγοντος τοῦ πράγματος, οὐπω δ' εἰς ἄμειλλαν ἐναγώνιον ἐξηγμένου* κ.τ.λ.

ἐξηγμένου would in any case be awkward after *ἀγοντος*, but even in sense it is hardly satisfactory. Read *ἐξηγμένον*. Tragedy had not yet been elevated to

the position
ταῦτὰ πρᾶττε
Plutarch is ra

3 τῆς τε
σεσθαι. He
8 τοῦ δ'
καθιέρωσαν.

πλείστος are
ἥδιστον δὲ Δ
λόγον εἶχε.
to be read
Tiberim fuit
Ant. Rom. 5
better with t

17 μηνύ
18 Tarc
(οὐδέν' ἂν) οἱ
21 ἱλασ
Cf. Demetris

3 τῇ μ
<μᾶλλον>

1 καὶ τ
ἀνελεῖν.

Certain
time. May
order havin
caused the
4 ἔστα
purity and
question fo

12 Th
μὲν τὴν κρ
οἰεσθα
not a comp
Livy 5. 32
are several

the position of an *ἀγών*. So in *Theseus* 6 ἐξήγεν αὐτὸν ὁ ζήλος καὶ ἀνῆρεθίξε ταῦτα πράττειν διανοούμενον I have little doubt that we should read ἐξήρην. Plutarch is rather fond of the word: see Wytttenbach's *Lexicon*.

PUBLICOLA.

3 τῆς τε βασιλείας ἀφίστασθαι καὶ πολεμοῦντα παύσασθαι. Read παύσασθαι. He was ready to resign the throne and would cease fighting.

8 τοῦ δ' Ἀρείου πεδίου τὸ ἡδίστον ἐκέκτητο Ταρκύνιος, καὶ τοῦτο τῷ θεῷ καθιέρωσαν. Through the similarity of ΗΔ and ΠΑ the words ἡδίστος and πλείστος are notoriously liable to interchange. So Plutarch's *Moralia* 421 c ἡδίστον δὲ Δελφῶν λόγον εἶχε appears in Eusebius in its true form πλείστον . . . λόγον εἶχε. When we recall this, we shall hardly doubt that τὸ πλείστον is to be read here. Livy 2. 5. 2 says: *ager Tarquiniorum qui inter urbem ac Tiberim fuit consecratus Marti Martius deinde campus fuit (fit?)*, and cf. D. Hal, *Ant. Rom.* 5. 13. Though not quite the same statement, τὸ πλείστον agrees better with this than τὸ ἡδίστον.

17 μηνύειν should be μηνύσειν.

18 Tarquin answered οὐδένα ποιεῖσθαι δικαστήν. We need either an ἄν (οὐδέν' ἄν) or ποιήσεσθαι.

21 ἱλασάμενος τῷ Αἰδῷ can hardly be anything but a mistake for τὸν Αἰδῶν. Cf. *Demetrius* 26 below.

COMP. SOLONIS ET PUBLICOLAE.

3 τῇ μὲν ἀρχῇ λαμπρότερος ὁ Σόλων . . . , τῷ τέλει δὲ ἄτερος εὐτυχῆς <μᾶλλον> καὶ ζηλωτός?

THEMISTOCLES.

1 καὶ τούτου γενομένου δοκεῖ πανούργως τὸν τῶν νόθων καὶ γνησίων διορισμὸν ἀνελεῖν.

Certainly we should expect ἐδόκει rather than δοκεῖ: *he was thought* at the time. May it be guessed that Plutarch wrote πανούργως ἐδόκει, and that, the order having been, as elsewhere, accidentally changed, hiatus after γενομένου caused the loss of the augment? Cf. *C. Caesar* 20 below.

4 ἔστω φιλοσοφώτερον ἐπισκοπεῖν whether Themistocles impaired the purity and perfection of the Athenian system. Perhaps φιλοσοφωτέρων, a question for men φιλοσοφώτεροι than Plutarch affects to be.

CAMILLUS.

12 The friends of Camillus, when his trial was impending, told him πρὸς μὲν τὴν κρίσιν αὐτῷ μηδὲν οἶσθαι βοηθήσειν, τὴν δὲ ζημίαν ὀφλόντι συνεκτίσειν.

οἶσθαι is really comic: *that they did not think they would help him*. Is it not a compression into one word of οἶοι τ' ἔσεσθαι, omitting one οἶ and one εσ? Livy 5. 32. 8 *se collatus quanti damnatus esset, absolvere eum non posse*. There are several well-established examples of such compression in the *Lives*, e.g. only

a few chapters earlier (7) *χρηματισάμενος* for *ἀχρήματος ἄσμενος*, *Demetr.* 36 *ἐπειγομένῳ* for *ἐπεὶ γενομένῳ*. Cf. *Plato Soph.* 257 E *ξυμβεβηκέναι* for *ξυμβέβηκεν* *εἶναι*: *Aristotle Post. An.* 2. 2. 90_A 27 *μᾶλλον* for *ἅμα δῆλον*, etc.

24 *κελεύουσι μὲν <ἀν> ὑπακούειν*, as the sense and *μηδὲν πολυπραγμονήσιν* show.

28 Read *σύν* (for *ἐν*) *νεκρῶν πλήθει*. *σύν* is probably better in itself, and *ἐν νεκρῶν πλήθει* . . . *ἐν ἐρείπιοις* would be clumsy.

PERICLES.

2 *ἐξέσται* (not *ἐξεστι*) *κρίνειν ἐκ τῶν γραφομένων*.

FABIUS MAXIMUS.

19 *τῶν πρώτων ἐχόμενος λογισμῶν ἐκείνων*.

Probably *πρωτέρων*. Cf. *Lysurgus* 19 above.

Ibid. *κιναμένην δέ (φησι) τὴν Φαβίου βεβαιότητα καὶ ἀσφάλειαν τῇ Μαρκελλοῦ συνηθείᾳ σωτήριον γενέσθαι τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις*.

συνηθείᾳ has been thought a mistake for some other word (cf. *Alcib.* 18 beginning). Perhaps the explanation is rather that some descriptive epithet, like *δραστηρίῳ*, used a dozen lines before, has been lost.

21 *αἱ μὲν οὖν πρώται τῶν ἡμερῶν ἦσαν καὶ . . . ἀνεπαύετο*.

ἦσαν gives but poor sense. Read *ἦσαν*, *were passing*. *Soph. O.C.* 618 *ὁ μῦθος χρόνος . . . ἰὼν*.

ALCIBIADES.

1 (end) If the optative is right in *ὅπως . . . δόξειεν*, we need *ἀν*.

6 (end) *ὅσακις ἀν λάβοι*.

ἀναλάβοι, or omit *ἀν*.

35 *τοῦτο τῶν κοινῶν ἐγκλημάτων πρῶτον ὑπῆρξε*.

καινῶν has been suggested. No doubt the real word was the third of the three apt to get intermixed, *κενῶν*.

C. MARCIUS.

4 *καὶ τοῖς προτέροις ἀεὶ τοὺς ὑστέρους ἡγεμόνας εἶχε περὶ τῆς ἐκείνου τιμῆς ἐρίζοντας καὶ μαρτυρίας ὑπερβαλέσθαι*.

For *καὶ* before *μαρτυρίας* read *ὡς=ὥστε, καί* and *ὡς* being often confused. Plutarch seems to use *ὑπερβάλλω* in the uncommon sense of *raising, making greater*. Thus *Tib. Gracch.* 8 *ὑρξαμένων τῶν πλουσίων ὑπερβάλλειν τὰς ἀποφοράς*: *Cim.* 8 *ὁ ἀγὼν . . . τὴν φιλοτιμίαν ὑπερέβαλε*. So here *μαρτυρίας ὑπερβαλέσθαι* is *go farther in testimony*.

7 *παρεῖχον αὐτοὺς τοῖς ἄρχουσιν χρῆσθαι προθύμως ἐπὶ τὸν πόλεμον*.

The adverb *προθύμως* is a mistake, familiar in this sort of phrase, for *προθύμοις*. As the words stand, the zeal is ascribed to the magistrates.

21 *οὐτ' εἰς καλὸν <βλέποντα> οὐτε συμφέρον οὐδέν?*

COMP. TIMOLEONTIS ET AEMILII PAULI.

2 δύναμιν οὐ ζητεῖν ἀλλ' ἔχειν ὀφείλων.

Read ζητῶν.

MARCELLUS.

24 τῆς νόσου παρακμὴν <τὴν> τῆς δυνάμεως ἐξανάλωσιν ἡγουμένους?

At the end of the chapter something like λέγουσι (ἐνιοι δὲ λέγουσι?) has been lost. So *Cato Maior* 8 (end) οὐδένα δὲ κ.τ.λ. wants an ἔφη, and *Aemilius Paulus* 16 πλῆθει . . . περιεῖναι something like λέγοντες (with only a comma at προκινδυνεύοντος).

ARISTIDES.

8 Read ἔχειν (not εἶχε) γὰρ αὐτοῦ μᾶλλον πίστιν. See my *Aristophanes and Others*, p. 182.

24 προσέταξαν αὐτῷ χώραν τε καὶ προσόδους ἐπισκεψάμενον ὁρίσαι τὸ κατ' ἀξίαν ἐκάστω καὶ δύναντιν.

The assessment was not individual and personal. Read therefore ἐκάστων.

COMP. ARISTIDIS ET CATONIS.

4 I think now that τῆς παρασκευῆς should be ταῖς παρασκευαῖς.

TITUS.

8 ὅτι παντὸς ὅλου τοῖς παρ' ἀλλήλων μέρεσι μᾶλλον ἢ δι' αὐτὸν ἰσχύει.

Some such original may be conjectured as παντὸς ὅλου παρ' ἀλλήλων τοῖς μέρεσι μᾶλλον ἢ δι' αὐτῶν ἡ ἰσχύς ἐστι.

PYRRHUS.

22 νομίζω ὡς ἀμφοτέρων ὑπαρχόντων ἀπολλύναι θάτερον <οὐ προσήκει> or something similar.

MARIUS.

43 τὴν ἐκβάλλουσαν (ψῆφον) should be ἐκβαλοῦσαν.

LYSANDER.

8 (end) οὐδὲ Λακωνικὸν <ὄν> τὸ χρῆσθαι κ.τ.λ.?

17 ἦν (love of money) οὐκ ἀφῆρει τὸ μὴ κεκτῆσθαι τὸν ἰδιώτην ὡς τὸ κεκτῆσθαι τὴν πόλιν εἰσποιεῖτο.

ὡς and some part of ὅσος are apt to get confused, and here we should restore ὅσον. 'It was not so much removed by one thing as introduced by the other.'

23 τοῖς πολλοῖς στρατιώταις ἡγεμονίας πραγμάτων καὶ διοικήσεις πόλεων διδούς.

It is inconceivable that Agesilaus gave these important functions to most soldiers. Who then served in the ranks? Applying τοῖς πολλοῖς, as οἱ πολλοί is applied four lines above, to most of the applicants for posts, we may conjecture στρατιωτικῶν ἡγεμονίας πραγματων. πράγματα indeed needs some limitation; otherwise διοικήσεις πόλεων would hardly have been mentioned separately.

SULLA.

10 οὗς μάλιστα τιμῶντες φοντο λυπεῖν ἐκείνον.

The meaning is *thought to annoy*, and this requires ἄν to be added (μάλιστα ἄν?) or λυπήσειν.

COMP. LYSANDRI ET SULLAE.

4 Read ὁ μὲν γε for ὁ μέντοι γε.

CIMON.

8 ἀπὸ φυλῆς μῆς ἕκαστον, where we certainly want some form of ἀπὸ φυλῆς ἐκάστης ἕνα, is an unusually pronounced instance of adjacent words exchanging the terminations of case, person, or whatever it may be, that belong to the two respectively. See my *Notes on Xenophon and Others*, p. 303. The example before us is unusually noticeable, because of the forms μῆς and ἕνα being so very distinct. It argues almost a confusion of thought rather than a mere *lapsus calami*; but the error should, I think, be put down to a copyist, not to Plutarch himself.

LUCULLUS.

9 ἐν τόπῳ κατὰ τῶν ὁδῶν ἀριστα πεφυκότι καὶ τῶν χωρίων.

κατὰ is not used in this way. Read καὶ τ. ὁδῶν . . . καὶ τ. χωρίων, like Thucydides' καλῶς παράπλου κείται, etc.

14 πάλαι μὲν αἰτίας δεόμενον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, εὐπρεπεστέραν δὲ οὐκ ἂν λαβόντα τῆς ὑπὲρ ἀνδρὸς οἰκείου καὶ βασιλέως, <ὡς> ἀναγκασθέντα ὑπουργεῖν αὐτῷ.

20 ἦν δὲ τοῦτο κοινὸν δάνειον.

Read τό for the meaningless τοῦτο.

22 (end) καὶ κείσθαι περὶ Σάφαν, ἐκεῖ τι χωρίον <ὄν> οὕτω καλούμενον?

27 καταφανῆς ἦν <ὁ> πρῶτος αἰετός?

37 ἔπεισεν αὐτῷ μὴ δοῦναι θρίαμβον.

The sense requires ἔπειθεν, *he urged them*, for they did grant it.

NICIAS.

11 ὕστερον δὲ ἡγανύκτου ὡς καθυβρισμένον τὸ πρᾶγμα τοῦτο πρὸς ἀνθρωπὸν ἀνάξιον γεγονέναι νομίζοντες (the ostracism of Hyperbolus).

The construction is very halting until we restore καθυβρισμένοι. The people, though a large part of them must (if the story is true) have joined in the understanding, thought themselves outraged by it.

18 οὐδένα τοῦ Γυλίππου λόγον ἔσχε προσπλέοντος οὐδὲ φυλακὴν ἐποίησατο καθαρὰν.

καθαρὰν is unintelligible and has been corrected in various ways. Possibly καὶ φρουράν.

28 Timæus affirms that Demosthenes and Nicias were not put to death by the Syracusans, ἀλλ' Ἑρμοκράτους πέμψαντος . . . καὶ δι' ἐνὸς τῶν φυλάκων παρέντων αὐτοῦς δι' αὐτῶν ἀποθανεῖν.

παρ
meaning

2 ὦ
Rat
(not ὕφ')
3 π
πολλοὺς

Do
speaking
λόγος m
τὸν λόγ
9 μ
Rea

3 χ
ἀπιστου
I c
will not
4 π
οἷς
idiomat
substan
therefor

2 γ
ἀσ
10
ἔργον ἐ
It
I c
depend
Plato L
22
additio

13
14
χρήσασ
NO.

παρέντων has been corrected to παρέντος, but even this gives no clear meaning. I should guess something like παραινέσαντος or παραινούντος.

CRASSUS.

2 ὥστε τῆς Ῥώμης τὸ πλείστον μέρος ὑπ' αὐτῷ γενέσθαι.

Rather ἐπ' αὐτῷ, in his hands, at his disposal. So in 14 read πᾶσαν ἐφ' (not ὑφ') ἑαυτοῖς ποιείσθαι τὴν ἡγεμονίαν.

3 παιδείας δὲ τῆς περὶ λόγον μάλιστα μὲν τὸ ῥητορικὸν καὶ χρειῶδες εἰς πολλοὺς ἥσκησε.

Does not μάλιστα κ.τ.λ., point to λόγων? If it were λόγον, the art of speaking, τὸ ῥητορικὸν would hardly be put as only a part of it. Of course λόγος may sometimes be appropriate, e.g. *Aratus* 3 ἐνδέεστερον ἴσως . . . περὶ τὸν λόγον ἐσπούδασε.

9 μὴ προσδοκῶν ὑπερβαλέσθαι τὴν Ῥωμαίων δύναμιν.

Read ὑπερβαλεῖσθαι.

COMP. NICIAE ET CRASSI.

3 χώραν οὐ δοτέον τοῖς πονηροῖς οὐδ' ἀρχὴν μὴ ἄρχουσιν οὐδὲ πίστιν ἀπιστουμένοις.

I cannot make any sense of ἄρχουσιν. Should it be ἄρξουσιν, men who will not exercise authority?

4 προσεργάσασθαι τὴν Ἀσίαν οἷς Πομπηϊὸς ἐπῆλθε καὶ Λούκουλλος ἀντέσχευ. οἷς ἐπῆλθε does not mean 'the regions that Pompey invaded.' It is the idiomatic use of the neuter pronoun and verb together as equivalent to a substantive: 'the expeditions of Pompey and the resistance of Lucullus.' There is therefore no reason for doubting the soundness of the words.

SERTORIUS.

2 γένος ἦν οὐκ ἀσημότατον.

ἀσημον?

10 καίτοι δοκεῖ . . . ὀμότητος καὶ βαρυθυμίας τὸ περὶ τοὺς ὀμήρους πραχθὲν ἔργον ἐπιδείξαι τὴν φύσιν οὐχ οὖσαν ἡμερον.

It has been proposed to insert μεστόν or γέμον to govern the genitives.

I conjecture ἡμερον to be a miswriting of ἔρημον, on which the genitives depend. ἔρημος has sometimes merely the meaning of *without*, *devoid of*, e.g. *Plato Laws* 862 E. ποιοῦντες ἀνδρῶν κακῶν ἔρημον τὴν πόλιν.

22 (end) δι' αἰτίας seems, if the words are themselves right, to need some addition, e.g. τινάς or an epithet.

EUMENES.

13 συνεπορεύοντο βουλευ<σ>όμενοι.

14 ἤλπικεν <ἀν> εἶναι, if it means *hoped to be*. So *Solon* 15 ἤλπιζε . . . χρῆσασθαι should be χρήσεσθαι.

AGESILAUS.

11 κάλλιστον υἱὸν μὲν ἔχων . . . καλὴν δὲ καὶ θυγατέρα.

Presumably κάλλιστον μὲν υἱὸν ἔχων.

At the end of the chapter read *ἄν* for *αὐ* (instead of adding it, as I formerly suggested).

23 πρὸς δὲ τοὺς λέγοντας ὅτι ταῦτα <οὐ> δοκεῖ τῷ μεγάλῳ βασιλεῖ (ταῦτα referring to the preceding praise of justice)?

30 ξυρῶνται <μὲν> μέρος τῆς ὑπῆνης, μέρος δὲ τρέφουσι.

μὲν lost before μερ.

36 Another *ἄν* seems lost in *κεῖ γὰρ κ.τ.λ. οὐ πάμπαν ἄμεμπτον <ἄν> εἶναι τὴν φιλοτιμίαν*. 'Even in that case it would have been liable to censure in so old a man.'

POMPEIUS.

1 In the first line (ἔοικε τοῦτο παθεῖν . . . ὅπερ κ.τ.λ.) write ταυτό.

8 οὐδένος ἂν προσδοκήσαντος . . . κοινώσασθαι, not -σασθαι. Cf. on *Eumenes* 14 above.

32 Is *ἐμβαλεῖν φρέαρ* the right expression? It is odd in itself and, seeing that Plutarch says *ἐμβαλεῖν ταφρόν* three or four times, we may think *ἐμβαλεῖν* more likely here.

58 οὐκ ἔφη λόγων ἀκροῦσασθαι καθήμενος, ἀλλ' ὁρῶν ὑπερφαινόμενα τῶν Ἀλπεων ἤδη δέκα τάγματα βαδίζειν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκπέμψειν τὸν ἀντιταξόμενον αὐτοῖς ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος.

Like others, I failed formerly to see that the change needed here is that of *βαδίζειν* to *βαδίζων*. *βαδίζων* is contrasted with *καθήμενος*.

80 ἦν δὲ <ή> γλυφὴ λέων ξιφήρης.

COMP. AGESILAI ET POMPEII.

1 τὴν βασιλείαν ἔδοξε λαβεῖν οὔτε τὰ πρὸς θεοὺς ἄμεμπτος οὔτε τὰ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους.

Read *ἄμεμπτος*.

ALEXANDER.

42 μέχρι τοιούτων ἐπιστολῶν τοῖς φίλοις ἐσχόλαζεν, οἷα γράφει παῖδα . . . κελύων ἀναζητήσαι.

Is *οἷα* grammatical? *οἷας*?

C. CAESAR.

4 οὐδεμίαν ἀρχὴν πράγματος ἡγήεον μικρὰν ἣν οὐ ταχὺ ποιεῖ μεγάλην τὸ ἐνδελεχὲς κ.τ.λ.

No doubt *οὕτω* is to be added to *μικρὰν*, as has been suggested. But ought not *ποιεῖ* to be *ποιήσκει*? 'No beginning of an affair is to be accounted so small that it will not (or cannot) be soon made great.' '*Is not*' fails to give good sense. So in *Alexander* 6 (end) *Μακεδονία γὰρ σε οὐ χωρήσει* would perhaps be more suitable than *οὐ χωρεῖ*, and in *Crassus* 11 *εἰπὼν ὅτι νικῶν μὲν ἔχοι*

πολλοὺς ἵππους
as seems neces
end of *Cato*
μμεῖσθαι.

11 ἐγὼ μ
δεύτερος. Not
or knew himse
seems wanted

20 οὐδεὶς
Not 'it is
survived. Cf

10 ὥσπερ

16 τὴν ἐ
μῶν ἐπεισαν

I would

26 καὶ τ

The emp

μείοντα.

28 Adop

(oddly expre

ἐπισκοπεῖν, I

disasters (e.g

had encoura

mysteries th

Macedonian

32 οὐδὲν

Read pe

(οὐδὲν φέτο

Eumenes abo

9 μικρὸν

This ma

the corruptio

regal?

17 προσ

The wo

24 εἶναι

made depen

unless εἶναι

next chapter

πολλοὺς ἵππους . . . , ἡττώμενος δὲ οὐ δέεται, if we are to substitute ἔξοι for ἔχοι, as seems necessary, we should probably change δέεται also to δεήσεται. At the end of *Cato Minor* μιμήσεσθαι has been restored by Cobet and Madvig for μιμίσθαι.

11 ἐγὼ μὲν ἐβουλόμην παρὰ τούτοις εἶναι μᾶλλον πρῶτος ἢ παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις δεύτερος. Not 'I could have wished,' for that would imply that he already was, or knew himself fated to be, the second man at Rome. ἐγὼ μὲν <ἂν> βουλόμην seems wanted.

20 οὐδεὶς ἂν δοκεῖ περιγενέσθαι.

Not 'it is thought' but 'it was thought' (ἐδόκει) that no one would have survived. Cf. *Themistocles* 1 above.

PHOCION.

10 ὥσπερ τῇ πλεονεξίᾳ μόνον . . . <ἄλλα οἱ καὶ> οὐχὶ μᾶλλον κ.τ.λ.

16 τὴν ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλὴν ἔχοντες ἐν τῷ δήμῳ δεόμενοι καὶ δακρύνοντες μὲν ἐπεισαν ἐπιτρέψαι τῷ Φωκίῳ τὴν πόλιν.

I would now read λέγοντες for ἔχοντες. The confusion occurs elsewhere.

26 καὶ τοῦτο πρῶτον ἦτοι τὸ μένοντα κατὰ χώραν ποιήσασθαι τὰς διαλύσεις.

The emphasis of τοῦτο τό seems pointless. Read τοῦτον πρῶτον ἢ τεῖτο μένοντα.

28 Adopting ἐν τοῖς μεγίστοις ἀτυχήμασι, not ἐν τοῖς ἀρίστοις εὐτυχήμασι (oddly expressed and not appropriate), and the conjecture ἐπισκοπεῖν for ἐπισκοπεῖν, I would read τοῖς θεοῖς. Formerly (they said) in their greatest disasters (e.g. the Persian occupation of Attica) the mystic sights and sounds had encouraged them and dismayed their foes (Herod. 8. 65?): now at the mysteries the gods there celebrated were thrown into the shade by the Macedonian garrison, and joy was turned to humiliation and mourning.

32 οὐδὲν ἡλπιζε περαίνειν.

Read περανεῖν, a correction that has certainly been made in *Cato Minor* 10 (οὐδὲν ᾤετο . . . περαίνειν) and may already have been made here. Cf. on *Eumenes* above.

CATO MINOR.

9 μικρὸν ἔργον ἡγεῖτο καὶ οὐ βασιλικόν.

This makes no sense. The conjecture οὐκ ἀνύσιμον makes fair sense, but the corruption is unaccounted for. Did Plutarch write καίτοι βασιλικόν, though regal?

17 προσκαλούμενος ἕκαστον <τὸν> ἔχοντα δημόσιον ἀργύριον.

The words can hardly stand as they are.

24 εἶναι τινὰς τοὺς κινουμένους καὶ κελεύοντας should certainly be read and made dependent on λέγεται. We must then add a καὶ or δέ to τὸν Καίσαρα, unless εἶναι <γάρ> . . . τὰ γεγραμμένα is preferred. At the beginning of the next chapter I would write καθαπερ <γάρ> rather than <καὶ> καθάπερ.

27 ἄλλον δὲ οὐδένα παρήκαν, ἣ μόλις ἐπισπάσας τῆς χειρὸς ὁ Κάτων τὸν Μουννάτιον ἀνήγαγε.

For ἣ should we write εἰ μὴ? It seems hardly possible that the words can mean οὐδένα ἄλλον ἢ τὸν Μουννάτιον, ὃν μόλις . . . ἀνήγαγε.

55 οὕτως ἔσται τοῖς λογισμοῖς ὡς κ.τ.λ.

Perhaps ἔσται should be ἔσχε or εἶχε. παρέσχε in Nic. 22 has been corrected with something like certainty to παρέστη.

69 ἄνδρα τοσοῦτον ἡλικία (for ἡλικίας) προήκοντα, as in Alcib. 18, seems likely, or <εἰς> τοσοῦτον ἡλικίας.

AGIS.

7 For ταῦτα μὲν ὁ Ἀγησίλαος, where the emphasis seems wrong, read ὁ μὲν Ἀ. ταῦτα, or possibly ταῦτα ὁ μὲν Ἀ.

CLEOMENES.

4 μάτην Λακεδαιμόνιοι πυνθάνονται κ.τ.λ.

μάτην is absurd with πυνθάνονται, as the editors have of course seen. Can it have strayed from a few lines above, οὐκ εἶπασε διακινδυνεύσαι . . . ἀλλ' ἀπῆλθε <μάτην>?

31 αἰσχρὸν γὰρ <καὶ> ζῆν μόνοις ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἀποθνήσκειν, dying as well as living.

34 πυνθανόμενος . . . τὰ πράγματα ποθεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ παρακαλεῖν ἐκείνον.

The difficulty is not in ἐκείνον and αὐτὸν referring to the same person, which is quite legitimate, but in the fact that only one pronoun is wanted. τὰ πράγματα ποθεῖν καὶ παρακαλεῖν suggests strongly by its personification that αὐτὸν should be αὐτά.

35 εἰ μὴ . . . <μὴ> μετρίως ἐξημιούτο.

The cause of the loss is clear.

DEMOSTHENES.

2 οἷσισι πλείων τε σχολὴ καὶ τὰ τῆς ὥρας ἔτι πρὸς τὰς τοιαύτας ἐπιχωρεῖ φιλοτιμίας.

ἐπιχωρεῖ lacks an accusative. We might think of reading προσέτι for ἔτι πρὸς, but probably a word, e.g. σπουδὴν or ἰσχύν, has been lost before ἔτι.

CICERO.

15 The decree authorising the consuls to act for themselves: δεξαμένους δ' ἐκείνους ὡς ἐπίστανται διοικεῖν καὶ σφῶζειν τὴν πόλιν.

If ὡς ἐπίστανται is a complete expression = *to the best of their judgment*, it suggests the possibility of understanding Aesch. P.V. 374 σεαυτὸν σφῶς ὅπως ἐπίστασαι and Eum. 581 ὅπως τ' ἐπίστα τήνδε κύρυσον δίκην in a corresponding manner.

23 τῶν εἰς τὸ μέλλον ἀρχόντων (ἀρξόντων?). In Dion 29 προσεῖλοντο . . . αὐτοῖς συνάρχοντα εἰκοσιν and Public. 1 ἡρέθη . . . συνάρχων I think the

present parti-
the future.

33 ἐκάκι

Do we n

38 χρῆσι

44 ἐδόκει

The con-
corrected.

47 καὶ τὰ

τάλλα is prob

Alex. 52 on

plausibly to

The last

clauses θηρία

is very rema

θηρία γάρ, as

be in the infi

2 συνεκε

βασιλική σεμ

Read δυ

of τις, which

33 below, Co

16 ὅταν

No doul

26 ἐτέλε

τὸν Δημ

lines earlier

23 τοῖς

Read ἀ

46 (end)

54 ὡς οἱ

The pa

prefer κατασ

66 We

τετραγώνων

79 ὃ πρ

τάλλα . . .

τοῦ lost

present participle may stand, though earlier Greek would probably have used the future. Cf. *Comp. Nic. et Crass.* 3 above.

33 ἐκάκιζεν αὐτὸς αὐτὸν προέμενος τὸν Κικέρωνα.

Do we not require προέμενον?

38 χρησιμώτερον <ἀν> ὄντα . . . εἰ μένων . . . ἡρμόζετο.

44 ἐδόκει δὲ καὶ μείζων τις αἰτία γεγονέναι.

The context points to δοκεῖ. In *Tib. Gracch.* 8 the same error has been corrected.

47 καὶ τὰλλα ταραχώδῃ καὶ παλίντροπα βουλευόμενα τῆς γνώμης μεταλαμβάνων. τὰλλα is probably a corruption of πολλά, which gives much better sense. In *Alex.* 52 on the other hand εἰς πολλὰ χαννότερον has been altered very plausibly to εἰς τὰλλα.

The last sentence of this chapter with the two imperfectly contracted clauses *θηρία δέ* (instead of *καὶ θηρία μὲν*) *αὐτῷ βοηθεῖ* and *αὐτοὶ δ'* οὐκ ἀμύνουσι is very remarkable and probably in some way wrong. We might think of *θηρία γάρ*, as *δέ* and *γάρ* get interchanged, but then the clauses would naturally be in the infinitive.

DEMETRIUS.

2 συνεκέκρατο τῷ νεαρῷ καὶ ἰταμῷ δυσμήτορος ἡρωική τις ἐπιφάνεια καὶ βασιλικὴ σεμνότης.

Read *δυσμμήτως*. That is better in itself and supported by the position of *τις*, which would otherwise naturally follow the first adjective. Cf. *Antoni* 23 below, *Comp. Ages. et Pomp.* 1 above.

16 ὅταν μάλιστα σύστασιν ὁ ἀγὼν ἔχῃ.

No doubt *σύντασιν*. An ἀγὼν is always a σύστασις.

26 ἐτέλουν τῷ Δημητρίῳ τὰ πρὸς Ἀγραν.

τὸν Δημήτριον? In τὰ μικρὰ τοῦ Ἀνθεστηρίωνος ἐτελοῦντο half a dozen lines earlier ἐτελοῦντο is personal, as ἐπώπτεον shows. Cf. *Publicola* 21 above.

ANTONIUS.

23 τοῖς μὲν οὖν Ἕλλησιν οὐκ ἄτοπος οὐδὲ φορτικὸς συνηρέχθη.

Read *ἀτόπως* and *φορτικῶς*, comparing *Demetrius* 2 above.

46 (end) ἴστω τὰς Κράσσου τύχας αὐτὸν ἐκδεχομένης (ἐκδεχομένης?).

54 ὥς οὐδὲ ἀκούσαι καλόν, εἰ . . . κατέστησε.

The past tense κατέστησε may be defended, but on the whole I should prefer καταστήσει.

66 We seem to need something like ἡ προσπέσειεν σκίφεσιν <ἐκ> τετραγώνων ξύλων μεγάλων σιδήρῳ δεδεμένων πρὸς ἄλλα συνηρμοσμένοις.

79 ᾧ προστετάκτο <τοῦ> ζῶσαν αὐτὴν φυλάττειν ἰσχυρῶς ἐπιμελούμενον τὰλλα . . . ἐνδιδόναι.

τοῦ lost after το.

DION.

31 ἐπισκήψεις τε δειναὶ μετ' ὀλοφυρμῶν καὶ τὸ μάλιστα κινήσαν αὐτὸν ἀξιούντος μὴ καθαιρεῖν κ.τ.λ.

Reading κινήσον or μάλιστ' <άν> κινήσαν, I now think that a participle in the genitive parallel to ἀξιούντος has been lost before καί, e.g., δεομένου.

BRUTUS.

36 Read καὶ (for ἢ) τί βουλόμενος.

37 Either <ό> ἡμέτερος οὗτος λόγος or possibly ἡμέτερος οὗτος . . . <ό> λόγος.

ARTAXERXES.

7 οὐ δὲ φηγομαχεῖν οὐδὲ <οὐ μόνον> Μηδίας ἐκστάντα καὶ Βαβυλῶνος ἀλλὰ καὶ Σούσων ἐνδύεσθαι τῇ Περσίδι.

GALBA.

29 In the last words read οἰκτίροντας for οἰκτίραντας.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

V 6 10
hostium na
Delen

IX 5
alia mala p
Immo

X 27
signa duo
Antiq
duelli aut

XII 5
momentis
uocant'.
Apte
nisi quod
uerteret, u
et reducta

XIII
ipsa reru
inanitates
lectauerin
'dele
retinuit G
Neque ta
aut quod
contemne
sapientia
sed oport
deratur ei
et rerum
opponat:
(Lipsius)
'lineas u

σαν αὐτῶν

participle
μένου.

ἄλλοι

CHARDS.

AD GELLIVM.

V 6 18 “Naualis” est, qua donari solet, maritimo proelio qui primus in hostium nauem [ui] armatus transiluit’.

Delendum uidetur [ui]; cf. Fest. p. 162 2, quem locum citat Hosius.

IX 5 6 ‘Critolaus Peripateticus et malum esse uoluptatem ait et multa alia mala parere ex sese, iniurias, desidiās, obliuiones, ignauias’.

Immo ‘incurias’.

X 27 3 ‘— populum Romanum misisse ad eos hastam et caduceum, signa duo belli aut pacis, ex quis utrum uellent eligerent eqs.’

Antiqui a Gellio asseruati sermonis agnoscere mihi uideor uestigia: ‘signa duelli aut pacis’.

XII 5 7 ‘Productiones tamen et relationes (relaxiones B) suis quaeque momentis distinctae diuisaeque sunt, quae προηγμένα et ἀποπροηγμένα ipsi uocant’.

Apte quidem Stephanus scholae uerbum restituens ‘reiectiones’ supposuit, nisi quod id egisse uidetur Gellius ut graeca latine quam proxime posset uerteret, unde praetulerim ‘reductiones’; cf. Cic. de Fin. V 30 90 ‘producta et reducta’.

XIII 8 2 ‘— et proinde sapere atque consulere ex his, quae pericula ipsa rerum docuerint, non quae libri tantum aut magistri per quasdam inanitates uerborum et imaginum tamquam in mimo aut in somnio delectauerint’.

‘delectauerint’ probata Stephani interpretatione (= ‘delectando dixerint’) retinuit Gronovius, oblitus delectationem ut mimi ita non somniū esse propriam. Neque tamen magis probandum est quod proposuit Hertz ‘deblaterauerint’, aut quod ex Ottii coniectura scripsit Hosius ‘delerauerint’, cum non pro contemnendis abiciantur libri et magistri, sed eorum opera ad comparandam sapientiam parum profici tantummodo arguatur (‘non libris solis—opus esse, sed oportere eum uersari quoque—in rebus comminus noscendis’); sed desideratur eiusmodi uerbum quod simul et mimi somniique notionibus congruat et rerum ipsarum soliditati ‘umbras uerborum inanium’ (XIII 24 2) bene opponat: tale autem non potius est ‘dictitauerint’ (Carrio) uel ‘dictauerint’ (Lipsius) uel ‘delibauerint’ (Hosius) quam ‘delineauerint’; cf. XVII 20 8 ‘lineas umbrasque facere’, Cic. N. D. I 27 75 ‘adumbratorum deorum

lineamenta', Plin. *N. H.* XXXV 10 36 14 '(Apelles) adrepto carbone—imaginem in pariete delineauit'.

XV 21 'Praestantissimos uirtute, prudentia, uiribus Iouis filios poetae appellauerunt, ut (*del.* ut ?) Aeacum et Minoa et Sarpedona; ferocissimos et inmanes et alienos ab omni humanitate tamquam e mari genitos Neptuni dixerunt, Cyclopa et Cercyona et Scirona et Laestrygonas'.

Nisi ab ipsis exemplis suis refelli mauis Gellium, scribe 'moribus.' Cf. lemma.

XVI 11 3 '— cum — quaesisses, in quarto denique Herodoti libro — inuenimus'.

Compendio restituto QVAESISSEM' (i.e. -mus) legendum esse uidetur.

XVII 9 17 'pugillaria noua nondum etiam cera inlita [ac]cepisse'.

Dittographiam remoui; cf. XIX 12 9 'falcem ac securim capit.'

XVIII 2 10 'Quaesitum ibi est, quae esset huius quoque sophismatis resolutio:'

Cum eiusdem haec atque praecedentia sint quaestionis, tertiae scilicet— quarta incipit 11, quinta 12 —, praue 'Quaesitum <tum>' suppleuit Hertz; 'inibi' autem, quod maluit Heiberg, quadraret si 'etiam' uel simile quid esset additum; mihi IBI Ë reliquiae esse uidentur antiquae scripturae IBIDË.

XIX 1 18 '— οὐ συγκατατίθεται οὐδὲ προσεπιδόξάζει' Verba 'οὐδὲ προσεπιδόξάζει' cur transponam post 'οὐ συγκατατίθεται' quod legitur 20, rationem a me reposcere neminem confido.

Rotterdam.

A. J. KRONENBERG.

AN expla
type ἡχὶ ῥόδα
as I am awar
satisfy any o
might start,
θεοὶ ἄλλοι T
that the spea
'Pindaric fig
good enough
of syntactic
so satisfacto
psychologica
historical an
investigator
In the case
we have no
an Idg. cons

The ex
2 Anm. 1, an
eis 'Ἀχέροντ
ἠέκων δματῆ
... διδύμους
179. The
things will
the nouns
persons or
Σκάμανδρος,
feature of th
real explan
In Ary
Vergl. Synt
is referred
mitrá = Mit
scanty trac

THE ΣΧΗΜΑ ΑΛΚΜΑΝΙΚΟΝ.

AN explanation on the principles of modern grammar of sentences of the type ἤχι ροὰς Σιμόεις συμβάλλετον ἡδὲ Σκάμανδρος, E 774, has not yet, so far as I am aware, been offered. And yet to call it the 'figure of Alcman' cannot satisfy any one. The psychological explanation is easy and obvious. We might start, for example, with such a sentence as ἀτὰρ σὲ Ζεὺς ἐρρύσατο καὶ θεοὶ ἄλλοι T 124, and suppose that the 'Alcmanic figure' was due to the fact that the speaker anticipated the second subject. A similar explanation of the 'Pindaric figure' is held in honour, and what will do for Pindar is presumably good enough for the poet from lofty Sardis. But the psychological treatment of syntactic phenomena, just because it now seems to us so natural and, often, so satisfactory, has its dangers. It should be held as an axiom that the psychological explanation of a syntactic construction must be deferred till the historical and comparative methods have first been applied; otherwise the investigator may merely blind himself to the real nature of the phenomenon. In the case of the 'Alcmanic figure' it may be possible, I think, to show that we have no new invention, but the disguised descendant of what was perhaps an Idg. construction.

The examples of the construction in Kühner-Gert, *Gr. Gramm.*, § 370, 2 Anm. 1, are: ἤχι ροὰς Σιμόεις συμβάλλετον ἡδὲ Σκάμανδρος, E 774; ἐνθα μὲν εἰς Ἀχέροντα Πυριφλεγέθων τε ῥέουσιν Κώκυτός τε, K 513; Κάστωρ τε πάλων ὠκέων δματῆρες, ἱππῶται σοφοὶ καὶ Πολυδένκης, Alcman, *fr.* 12; πέμπε δ' Ἑρμᾶς . . . διδύμους υἱοὺς τὸν μὲν Ἐχίονα κεχλάδοντα ἦβα τὸν δ' Ἑρυντον, Pindar, *P.* 4, 179. The ex. T 138 is somewhat different, as will be shown later. Two things will be observed in reading the above examples. In the first place, the nouns refer to living or personified things; and in the second place, the persons or things mentioned are such as were commonly associated, Σιμόεις: Σκάμανδρος, Κάστωρ: Πολυδένκης, Ἐχίονα: Ἑρυντον. This is an important feature of the construction, and points very clearly to what I consider to be its real explanation.

In Aryan there is a peculiar use of the dual, discussed by Delbrück, *Vergl. Syntax*, I. 137 ff. When a pair of persons or things usually associated is referred to, the name of one in the dual is used to denote them both: *mitrá* = Mitra and Varuna; *dhanī* (lit. 'two days') = day and night. Very scanty traces of a similar usage in other idg. languages have been pointed out.

Thus, according to Wackernagel, *Αἶαντε* = Aias and Teukros in Greek.¹ In Latin *Castores* = Castor and Pollux, *Ceres* = Ceres and Proserpine, doubtless take the place of an original dual, as do *feðgar* = father and son, in O. Norse, and *tevaŕ* (lit. 'fathers') = father and mother, in Lithuanian. From this usage, according to the view of Delbrück, developed the other by which this *elliptical dual* is followed by the dual of the other member of the pair, cf. Edgerton, KZ, xliii., 110 ff., *Origin and development of the elliptic dual and of dvandva compounds*. Thus *mitrā* = Mitra and Varuna was followed by *mitrāvaruṇāu*, as in the example quoted by Delbrück, *ib.* from RV. 6, 51, 1. Logically, if not historically, between those two constructions stands a third, where the original elliptic dual is supplemented not by the dual, but by the singular of the name of the other member of the pair. An example is given by Delbrück RV. 8, 25, 2, *mitrā tāmā nā rathāyā vāruṇo yāc ca sukrātuḥ sanāt. . .*

A variant of this construction is the substitution for the dual of the noun of the dual of the pronoun actually expressed or implied in the verb. Examples of this from different languages are given by Edgerton, *ib.*² An instance from Skt. is RV. 7, 88, 3 *ā yād ruhāva Vāruṇaṣca nāvam*, 'when we two went on board the ship (I) and Varuna,' an exact parallel to the O. Irish *convrancatar ocus Dubthach*, B. Arm. 18a1.

We have now the following stages in the history of the construction: (1) the elliptic dual with verb in concord; (2) the double dual; (3) the elliptic dual with explanatory singular; and (4) the dual pronoun, either expressed or implied in the dual form of the verb, followed by an explanatory singular. For (3) the only clear case in Skt. has the verb in the singular, for the explanatory singular noun *Varunas* intervenes between it and the dual; but from the analogy of (4) we can scarcely doubt that such a sentence of *mitrā gatām varuṇaṣ ca* would be quite in the strict line of development. How illogical such a type of sentence was would at once be apparent. One obvious means of making it logical was to substitute the singular for the leading dual: thus for *mitrā gatām varuṇaṣ ca* we should have *mitro gatām varuṇaṣca*. Such, or nearly such, a type of sentence we have in RV. 1, 135, 4 *vāyav ā candrēma rādhasā gatam indraṣca rādhasā gatam* (quoted by Edgerton, *ib.* 112).

The true explanation of the 'Alcmanic figure' is now clear. In the example from Alcman, *Κάστωρ τε Πώλων ὠκέων δματῆρες . . . καὶ Πολυδεύκης* we have the logical development of *Κάστορε (or κάστορες δύο) . . . καὶ Πολυδεύκης*. Although in the earliest Greek the original form of the construction as seen in Aryan has disappeared, or almost disappeared, still it has left a very significant trace in the fact that the nouns in the 'Alcmanic figure' are invariably such as refer to persons and things associated by usage, and therefore felt to form a natural group. Simoeis and Skamander, the two well-known rivers of the Troad; Pyriphlegethon and Kokytos, the familiar names of the rivers of Hell;

¹ This is by no means certain, and, at the suggestion of the Editor, I refrain from utilizing the passages in the *Iliad* where the word occurs.

² To his examples from O. Irish add from

M. Irish *Tain bó Fraich* (*Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy Irish MSS. Series*, I. 1, 1870, 140, 18; 152, 27. For other exx. v. W. Stokes. *Kuhus Beitrüge*, II. 394 f.

Kastor and construction does not ac

A second sented by T καὶ οὐκ εἰς Alcman' in thought th circumstan

KING'S C

Kastor and Polydeukes, the famous twin brethren. This is a feature of the construction which must be explained, and which the psychological method does not account for.

A secondary development from the 'Alcmanic figure' is the type represented by ΤΙ 38, εἰ δέ κ' Ἀρης ἄρχωσι μάχης ἢ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων | ἢ Ἀχιλλῆϊ ἰσχωσι καὶ οὐκ εἰδῶσι μάχεσθαι. This type of sentence differs from the 'figure of Alcman' in being disjunctive, and could arise only when it had come to be thought that the verb standing between two singular nouns could under all circumstances be made dual or plural.

J. FRASER.

KING'S COLLEGE, ABERDEEN.

LE PREMIER LIVRE DES COMMENTAIRES ET LES CRITIQUES DE M. T. RICE HOLMES.

M. T. RICE HOLMES a publié, dans le no. 3^o du III^{me} V. de cette Revue, d'ingénieuses observations sur la reconstruction du premier livre des Commentaires, que j'ai faite dans le IInd volume de ma *Greatness and Decline of Rome*. Mais il me semble qu'il n'a pas bien saisi le point capital de ma reconstruction. Le point est représenté par cette question : pourquoi César a conclu en 59 A.Ch. l'alliance avec Arioviste, et l'an suivant, en 58, a brisé cette alliance, en lui déclarant la guerre à l'improviste ? Les Commentaires ne donnent pas une réponse satisfaisante à cette question ; et l'historien doit la chercher, s'il veut comprendre la politique de César en Gaule.

Commençons par la première question : pourquoi César fit en 59 l'alliance avec Arioviste ? 'Mere scholars who have not, like Signor Ferrero,' écrit M. Holmes (p. 213), 'had the advantage of intimate acquaintance with practical politics have found no difficulty in accounting for Caesar's having . . . associated himself with the Senate in bestowing upon Ariovistus the titles of King and Friend. He foresaw that when he went to Gaul he would have to deal both with the Helvetii and with Ariovistus ; and to dispose of two formidable hosts separately would be quite as much as he could manage.' L'explication paraît d'abord satisfaisante ; mais la lecture attentive des Commentaires nous prouve que ni les Helvètes ni Arioviste ne désiraient que de vivre en paix avec César (cf. *B. G.* I, 13 ; I, 44), et bien loin d'avoir songé à une alliance contre César, regardaient une guerre contre lui comme une chose presque impossible. C'est César qui provoque les Helvètes et Arioviste ; qui s'acharne à leur créer des embarras et des difficultés ; et qui les oblige à tirer l'épée. Dans ces conditions, on ne comprend pas quel besoin il avait d'empêcher l'union de deux puissances, qui n'avaient jamais pensé à le combattre, ni unies ni séparées. M. Holmes objectera que c'était là une précaution, peut-être superflue, mais toujours utile, car elle ne coûtait rien à César. 'The bestowal of the titles cost nothing, and would probably keep Ariovistus quiet for the time' (p. 210). . . . 'Such titles had often been bestowed by the Senate upon the princes of remote Gallic tribes.' Malheureusement, si, à l'ordinaire, ces titres ne coûtaient rien au sénat, dans cette occasion le titre octroyé à Arioviste pouvait coûter fort cher à Rome : rien

CÉSA

moins que
avait toujou
coupait cou
débarasser d
des républic
Rien n'est p
et de son ch
la cavalerie
César, ni m
Dumnorix, c
pas châtier
son conseil.
only with the
dit que le
Divitiacus (c
re futurum,
pour Dumn
y avait eu e
où César en
à un minim
possible ; m
national de
question de
et difficile q
voit facilem
avantages.

L'autre
brisée—n'es
'were . . .
to suffer by
leaving Ari
pour un act
que César r
romain en
guerre app
la *lex Vatin*
faire la gue
que, par c
César lui-m
par les con
suffisantes.
XX^{me} siècle
silence à s
provocation

moins que tout son prestige en Gaule et l'appui du parti romanophile, qui avait toujours existé au delà des Alpes. En s'alliant avec Arioviste, Rome coupait court aux espérances que tout un parti plaçait en elle pour se débarrasser d'Arioviste et détruisait la possibilité de toute politique, au milieu des républiques celtiques. Le premier livre des Commentaires le prouve. Rien n'est plus frappant, dans ce livre, que la faiblesse du parti romanophile et de son chef, Divitiacus. Ce parti est obligé à laisser le commandement de la cavalerie à Dumnorix ; il n'ose ni contrecarrer les intrigues de celui-ci contre César, ni même les révéler à César ; quand César découvre le trahison de Dumnorix, c'est Divitiacus, le chef du parti contraire, qui supplie César de ne pas châtier le traître, et avec des arguments si persuasifs, que César se rend à son conseil. M. Holmes m'objecte que l'expédition des Helvètes '*was popular only with the nationalists*' (p. 211) : oui, mais dans le cas, César lui-même nous dit que le parti nationaliste représentait la presque totalité de la Gaule. Divitiacus (B. G. I, 20) supplie César de ne pas toucher à Dumnorix : *qua ex re futurum, ut totius Galliae animi a se averterentur*. Toute la Gaule était donc pour Dumnorix, et pour les Helvètes contre César. Pourtant de tous les temps il y avait eu en Gaule un fort parti romanophile. Pour quelle raison, au moment où César entre en Gaule, ce parti semble ne plus exister, ou, au moins, être réduit à un minimum d'influence ? L'alliance avec Arioviste est la seule explication possible ; mais c'est une explication suffisante. En s'alliant avec l'ennemi national de la Gaule, Rome s'aliénait toutes les sympathies des Gaulois. La question de savoir pourquoi César a fait cette alliance est donc plus complexe et difficile que M. Holmes ne le suppose ; car il s'agit d'une alliance dont on voit facilement les inconvénients, et dont on a de la peine à découvrir les avantages.

L'autre question—pourquoi un an après avoir fait cette alliance César l'a brisée—n'est pas moins difficile. 'His motives . . .' écrit M. Holmes (p. 212), 'were . . . simply prudential. He did not intend to allow Roman prestige to suffer by leaving the allies in the lurch, or to imperil Roman interests by leaving Ariovistus to do what he pleased.' Cette explication est trop simple, pour un acte aussi grave que la guerre contre Arioviste. M. Holmes a oublié que César n'était pas autorisé par les lois de son pays à défendre le prestige romain en Gaule d'après ses idées personnelles ; que le droit de déclarer la guerre appartenait au sénat et non pas aux gouverneurs de province ; que la *lex Vatinia* n'avait pas donné à César, avec la Gaule Cisalpine, le droit de faire la guerre et la paix ; qu'Arioviste était ami et allié du peuple romain ; et que, par conséquent, cette guerre était *illégal*, d'une manière manifeste. César lui-même nous en donne la preuve décisive, quand il justifie son attaque par les considérations générales sur le prestige romain, que M. Holmes trouve suffisantes. Ces justifications ont une grande valeur pour ses admirateurs du XX^{me} siècle. Mais César écrivait pour ses contemporains ; et pour imposer le silence à ses ennemis, qui l'accusaient d'avoir agi en Gaule contre les lois, une provocation précise d'Arioviste, fournissant un prétexte raisonnable pour briser

l'alliance, aurait servi beaucoup mieux que tous les profonds plans politiques exposés par César, au chapitre que M. Holmes a tant admiré. Une guerre illégale était toujours une aventure risquée pour un gouverneur romain qui avait beaucoup d'ennemis à Rome; et l'illégalité était dans ce cas si grande que les soldats refusèrent de marcher, en disant entre autres choses (Dion, 38, 39), que la guerre n'était *οὔτε προσήκοντα οὔτε ἐψηφισμένον*, 'ni juste ni légale.' Il n'est donc pas possible d'expliquer la guerre d'Arioviste, que par un motif *urgent*, qui ne permettait pas à César d'attendre jusqu'au moment où il pourrait faire naître un *casus belli* un peu plus sérieux; et qui l'a obligé à marcher au devant de tous les dangers impliqués dans une guerre illégale.

Le lecteur connaît peut-être la théorie que j'ai émise pour expliquer ce point obscur. L'alliance avec Arioviste fut l'effet des craintes excessives qu'excita à Rome le mouvement des Helvètes. On crut que les Helvètes allaient préparer, par le conquête de la Gaule, une nouvelle invasion de l'Italie, comme celle des Cimbres et des Teutons, tandis que leur émigration avait été simplement machinée par le parti national gaulois pour chasser Arioviste. Les intrigues du parti romanophile des Éduens et ceux d'Arioviste ne furent pas étrangers, probablement, à ces craintes exagérées de l'opinion publique à Rome, dont la cause première doit être cherchée dans l'ignorance profonde où l'on était à Rome sur les affaires gauloises. Quoi qu'il en soit; César, obéissant à l'opinion publique, fit l'alliance avec Arioviste contre les futurs nouveaux Cimbres et Teutons; et s'engagea résolument dans la politique antihelvétique. Entré en Gaule, il s'attaqua aux Helvètes et il les obligea à renoncer à leur mouvement, en faisant rater par là le plan conçu par le parti national contre Arioviste. Mais la guerre finie, il s'aperçut que s'il en restait là, il aurait tout simplement travaillé pour le roi des Suèves; qu'il en était fait pour toujours du prestige et des sympathies dont Rome jouissait parmi les Gaulois; qu'il n'y aurait plus un parti romanophile dans toute la Gaule. Comme à ce moment là il ne pensait pas encore à annexer la Gaule, cette situation représentait un véritable désastre pour la politique romaine en Gaule. Pour éviter ce désastre, il se tourna contre Arioviste, poussé par les chefs du parti romanophile, pour les quels la guerre contre Arioviste était le seul moyen de rétablir leur situation, fort compromise par l'alliance de Rome avec les Suèves.

Je crois que cette hypothèse éclaircit d'une manière satisfaisante certains points obscurs de notre histoire. Mais je reconnais qu'on ne peut l'accepter, qui si on ne trouve, dans les textes et dans les faits, aucun argument qui soit en contradiction avec elle. M. Holmes croit en avoir trouvé plusieurs. Nous allons donc les examiner. Pourquoi, me demande M. Holmes à p. 213, le parti romanophile a laissé César faire la guerre contre les Helvètes et *kept him in ignorance* sur son véritable caractère, au lieu de le lancer tout de suite sur Arioviste? Parce que César agissait d'après les idées qu'on avait, sur la situation de la Gaule, à Rome; et non pas d'après les idées des Éduens. À

Rome on ne
helvétique; on
Cimbres et T
chassant Ari
pouvait pas a
courageaient à F
essaye en suite
le but que j'ai
when did the
réponds que j
parti de Dum
des territoires
toires, pour p
Arioviste. M
was in the p
himself whet
neighbourhoo
neighbourhoo
ward to the p
or more "tow
against a po
planned outs
supposer que
complète, att
qu'on lui de
Rhin, pour s'
saire de suppl
campait. Q
à celui qui l'
veulent aujou
la France du
Pourquoi les
voulaien pas
pouvaient le
portaient ave
croire qu'a
Helvètes pou
Mais M
Before the b
from the vall
Having been
coast' (p. 20
indiqué avec
commençant

Rome on ne voyait à ce moment dans les affaires gauloises que le danger helvétique ; on se préoccupait d'arrêter à des débuts le mouvement des nouveaux Cimbres et Teutons, et non pas de rétablir l'indépendance de la Gaule, en chassant Arioviste, en qui on voyait plutôt un allié utile et un ami. César ne pouvait pas agir à sa guise en Gaule ; il devait tenir compte des idées qui couraient à Rome, dans le monde politique et dans le public. M. Holmes essaye en suite de prouver que l'émigration des Helvètes ne pouvait pas avoir le but que j'ai supposé ; et il commence par me demander (p. 209) : 'how and when did they (les Helvètes) propose to drive back Ariovistus?' À cela je réponds que je n'en sais rien. Ce qui me semble le plus probable, c'est que le parti de Dumnorix cherchait à transporter cette population belliqueuse dans des territoires situés dans le nord-est de la Gaule, de l'établir dans ces territoires, pour pouvoir recruter un jour dans cette population une armée contre Arioviste. Mais M. Holmes ajoute des objections topographiques. 'Ariovistus was in the plain of Alsace. Let Signor Ferrero look at his map, and ask himself whether a movement more insane than a trek from Geneva to the neighbourhood of Lyons, across the Saône, up the valley of the Saône to the neighbourhood of Macon, then westward toward Toulon-sur-Arroux, then northward to the plateau of Langres, and then back again eastward a hundred miles or more "toward the Rhine"—a trek in bullock-carts full of non-combatants, against a powerful host which there was no motive for attacking—was ever planned outside Bedlam.' Mais j'ai déjà dit qu'il n'est point nécessaire de supposer que l'émigration des Helvètes allait, comme une armée en formation complète, attaquer immédiatement Arioviste ; elle allait occuper les territoires qu'on lui donnait, comme les Germains qu'Arioviste faisait venir d'outre Rhin, pour s'y tenir prête à fournir une armée. Il n'est donc non plus nécessaire de supposer que les Helvètes se dirigeaient vers l'endroit où Arioviste campait. Quant à la route prise par les Helvètes, elle peut sembler 'insane' à celui qui l'étudie sur une carte de l'Europe moderne. Evidemment ceux qui veulent aujourd'hui se rendre du territoire situé entre les Alpes et le Jura dans la France du nord-est n'ont pas besoin de passer par Macon, Autun, et Langres. Pourquoi les Helvètes ont-ils pris, il y a dix-neuf siècles, ce chemin ? Parce qu'ils voulaient passer par le riche territoire des Éduens, qui étaient leurs amis et qui pouvaient leur donner des vivres. César lui-même nous dit que les Helvètes portaient avec eux seulement le blé suffisant pour trois mois ; et il ne faut pas croire qu'à cette époque une masse d'hommes aussi considérable que les Helvètes pouvait trouver des vivres partout, en Europe.

Mais M. Holmes nie aussi que les Helvètes ont marché vers le nord-est. Before the battle in which they have been defeated they had struck westwards, from the valley of the Saône with the object of reaching their destination. . . Having been defeated, they were not permitted to move toward the Atlantic coast' (p. 209). Après avoir traversé la Saône, à un point qui ne peut être indiqué avec précision (probablement aux environs de Macon), les Helvètes commencent une longue marche, qui dure plusieurs jours, et sur la quelle César

nous donne seulement deux indications topographiques. La première nous apprend que la colonne des Helvètes est arrivée à la hauteur de Bibracte; la seconde qu'elle a continué sa route, après la bataille, pour Langres. Il suffit de regarder une carte, pour voir que cet itinéraire indique l'intention de marcher vers le nord-est. M. Holmes paraît attribuer cette direction à la bataille; mais il n'en est rien. Les Helvètes étaient arrivés à la hauteur de Bibracte avant la bataille; ce sont eux donc, qui avaient entraîné à leur remorque les Romains vers le nord. Quant à la bataille, qui fut donnée par les Helvètes et non par les Romains, elle semble avoir eu pour seul résultat, celui d'arrêter les Romains, qui furent obligés de rester trois jours sur le champ de bataille pour soigner les blessés et enterrer les morts, tandis que les Helvètes continuaient, sans plus en être molestés, leur marche. Si les Helvètes allaient leur chemin avant la bataille, quand ils étaient talonnés par les Romains, il est au moins téméraire de supposer qu'ils se sont jetés à l'aventure, dans la Gaule, sur la première route qu'ils ont trouvée, quand ils avaient réussi à immobiliser l'ennemi pour trois jours et à le distancer de toute la marche qu'ils avaient pu accomplir en trois jours.

M. Holmes ne voit pas dans le récit de César les contradictions que j'ai cru signaler. Si César a attribué à l'émigration des Helvètes deux buts très différents—la conquête de la Gaule et l'émigration dans la Saintonge—c'est que les plans des Helvètes avaient changé après la mort d'Orgetorix. Telle est l'explication de la difficulté qu'il donne à p. 208. À la p. 207 il en avait déjà donnée une autre, qui ne me semble pas s'accorder avec la seconde: c'est que l'émigration dans le Saintonge était une véritable invasion de la Gaule, et en avait tous les dangers. 'Unless we grant Signor Ferrero's assumption that the proposed trek into Saintonge was harmless, his whole case breaks down.' Les deux explications, contradictoires entre elles, me semblent toutes les deux insoutenables. Le changement du plan, produit par le mort d'Orgetorix, est une hypothèse de M. Holmes pour écarter du texte de César la contradiction; mais cette-ci n'existe pas moins pour cela. César (*B. G.* I, 2) dit qu'Orgetorix persuade les Helvètes *perfacile esse . . . totius Galliae imperio potiri*. Plus loin (chap. 5) ajoute: *Post eius (Orgetorix) mortem nihilominus Helvetii id quod constituerant facere conantur, ut e finibus suis exeant*. César dit donc très clairement le contraire de ce que M. Holmes affirme—c'est-à-dire que la mort d'Orgetorix n'avait rien changé aux plans des Helvètes. Et voilà enfin qu'au dixième chapitre on annonce tout à coup à César *Helvetiis esse in animo . . . iter in Santonum fines facere*: cette dernière affirmation n'est-elle pas différente de la précédente?

Quant à l'autre explication, il me semble que César lui-même la réfute. Si l'émigration dans la Saintonge avait été une entreprise aussi dangereuse pour l'empire romain, que la conquête de la Gaule entière dont l'intention était attribuée aux Helvètes, pourquoi aurait-il justifié en définitive son mouvement offensif contre les Helvètes par la nécessité d'aider les Éduens, dont le territoire aurait été pillé par les Helvètes (ce qui n'était pas, d'ailleurs, exact)?

Pourquoi au-
une si bonn
misrepresen
only . . .
decided to
les chapitre
César dit, q
alla cherche
Province.
visité par le
les secourir
donc par le
statut d'imm
pervenirent.
historien a
représentati

M. Ho
affirmer que
son aide co
sumere. Su
obligé d'adr
qu'il tenait
serait détes
popularité,
raconte dan

Enfin
if it had be
had never l
it?" En r
politique av
Helvètes vo
assez de pe
mistificatio
démentis à
avaient vo
raconte ?
helvétique;
rester dans
gauloises;
et à renonc
bres et Te
attenuée, la
explique l'a
contradicti

Pourquoi aurait-il eu recours à cette explication mensongère, quand il en avait une si bonne aux yeux des Romains ? M. Holmes (p. 207) m'accuse de 'pure misrepresentation,' parce que j'affirme que César veut faire croire 'that it was only . . . after the ambassadors of the Aedui asked him for help that he decided to attack the Helvetii.' Puis-je prier M. Holmes de relire avec moi les chapitres X et XI du premier livre des Commentaires ? Au X^{me} chapitre César dit, qu'ayant appris l'intention des Helvètes d'aller dans la Saintonge, il alla chercher son armée au delà des Alpes et qu'il revint avec elle dans la Province. Au chapitre XI il raconte qu'il fut, à sa rentrée dans la Province, visité par les ambassadeurs des Éduens et d'autres peuples qui le prièrent de les secourir contre les Helvètes. Et il ajoute : '*Quibus rebus adductus* (persuadé donc par les remontrances des ambassadeurs) Caesar non expectandum sibi statuit dum, omnibus fortunis sociorum consumptis, in Santonos Helvetii pervenirent.' Le texte est si clair, que je ne conçois pas comment un historien aussi distingué que M. Holmes ait pu m'accuser de 'misrepresentation.'

M. Holmes me demandera probablement sur quoi je m'appuie pour affirmer que César a altéré la vérité, quand il nous a décrit les Éduens implorant son aide contre les Helvètes qui menaçaient de *omnes fortunas sociorum consumere*. Sur ce fait : que quelques chapitres plus loin (au XVII^{me}) César est obligé d'admettre que Dumnorix, le protecteur des Helvètes, était si populaire, qu'il tenait en échec tout le gouvernement et que celui qui toucherait à lui serait détesté par toute la Gaule. Il serait difficile de comprendre une telle popularité, si les Helvètes avaient mis la Gaule à fer et à feu, comme on le raconte dans le onzième chapitre.

Enfin M. Holmes fait encore une objection : 'Is it not self-evident that if it had become "notorious" that the plan of conquering the whole of Gaul had never been formed, Caesar would not have been so foolish as to describe it?' En réalité, César a compris qu'il ne pouvait pas expliquer toute sa politique avec les Helvètes en se servant de cette prétendue conquête que les Helvètes voulaient faire. Il y avait désormais, à la fin des guerres gauloises, assez de personnes renseignées à Rome, qui n'auraient pas été dupes de cette mistification ; et d'ailleurs la narration même aurait donné le plus éloquent des démentis à cette assertion. Est-il possible d'admettre que si les Helvètes avaient voulu conquérir la Gaule, ils se seraient conduits comme César le raconte ? Mais beaucoup de personnes avaient cru en Italie au grand danger helvétique ; un souvenir confus des craintes ressenties au 60 et 59 devait encore rester dans l'esprit public, à l'époque où César écrivait, vers la fin des guerres gauloises ; César n'avait aucun intérêt à détromper entièrement ses lecteurs et à renoncer à ce qui lui restait de la gloire d'avoir vaincu les nouveaux Cimbres et Teutons. Ainsi il a laissé glisser, dans son récit, sous une forme atténuée, la légende qui avait inspiré la politique romaine en 60 et 59 et qui explique l'alliance avec Arioviste, en comptant qu'on ne s'apercevrait pas de la contradiction entre le commencement et la suite du récit, déguisée par lui

avec beaucoup d'art. Il ne s'est pas trompé d'ailleurs ; je crois avoir été le premier, après vingt siècles, à avertir cette contradiction ; M. Holmes lui-même, qui pourtant a si bien étudié les Commentaires, ne s'en était pas aperçu. Il a fait plus : il a employé toute sa doctrine pour prouver que la contradiction n'existe pas. Décidément César a eu beaucoup de chance, non seulement comme guerrier, mais aussi comme historien.

GUGLIELMO FERRERO.

It is a
language fa
Latin write
like that of
sistency of
the Latin w
blindly follo
ever, found
the Latin g
Latin chang
a stress acco
it did so in
suggested a
always cont
it was by G
these variou
seem to me
(a) Mu
'sing-song.'
retained a n
more notice
is, perhaps,
that someti
no little am
general way
likely that,
unique 'sin
who spoke
directed at
pedes Habi

nu us sonu
barbariae au

NOTES ON LATIN WORD-ACCENT.

It is a well-known fact that, although the morphology of the Latin language favours the assumption that its accent was primarily one of stress, Latin writers before the fourth century invariably regarded it as one of pitch, like that of Greek. The majority of those who have discussed this inconsistency of data have accepted the evidence of morphology rather than that of the Latin writers, maintaining that the latter were misled in their theories by blindly following Greek doctrines. Vendryes (*Recherches*, Paris, 1902), however, found not a little favour in his attempt to rehabilitate the credibility of the Latin grammarians. Nevertheless, the theory which he proposed—that Latin changed from a stress to a pitch accent before Varro, and back again to a stress accent before the Middle Ages—was scarcely satisfactory, assuming as it did so incredibly rapid a shift. Recently Abbott (*Cl. Phil.* II., p. 444) suggested a compromise. He believes that, while in popular Latin the accent always continued to be primarily one of stress, in formal Latin, influenced as it was by Greek, a pitch accent was for a while in vogue. I shall not discuss these various theories; I only wish to offer some minor considerations which seem to me to have some bearing upon the problem.

(a) Musical accent of words, as is well known, gives speech a peculiar 'sing-song.' Americans notice this in the speech of the English, who have retained a marked element of pitch in their accent. The phenomenon is even more noticeable in the speech of Swedes and Norwegians, whose word-accent is, perhaps, primarily one of pitch. In fact, in the 'immigrant comedies' that sometimes appear on the American stage, this modulation is a source of no little amusement. Now, though the Latin writers found it possible in a general way to apply the rules of Greek accent to their own language, it is likely that, if their accent was more intensive, they must have been aware of a unique 'sing-song' in the speech of the Greeks and of the Greek immigrants, who spoke Latin imperfectly. Some of the satire of Petronius seems to be directed at this very phenomenon. His words are (Sat. 68): 'seruus qui ad pedes Habinnæ sedebat . . . proclamauit subito *canora uoce* :

Interea medium Aeneas iam classe tenebat.

nu us sonus unquam *acidior* percussit aures meas; nam praeter *errantis barbariae* aut *adiectum* aut *deinutum clamorem* miscebat Atellanicos uersus, etc.

In ch. 59 the same method of reading is ascribed to Trimalchio, 'ille *canora uoce Latine legebat librum*.'

Petronius is satirizing the manners and utterances of Greek and Asiatic-Greek freedmen near Naples. He has made fun of their mistakes in grammatical forms, in diction, and in pronunciation. It seems to me that in the passages just cited he also satirizes the 'sing-song' of the musical accent that Greeks would naturally carry into their reading of Latin. The words '*canora uoce, acidior, errantis*' (taken literally), most naturally refer to the rise and fall of pitch, which, by the evidence of what follows, is displeasing to the Roman ear. *Adiectum aut deminutum clamorem* may well refer to the same thing.

If this interpretation is correct, if the educated Roman was in the habit of detecting the nationality of the despised Graeculus by the varying pitch of his accent, then we can safely use this passage as contributing further evidence to the fact that the Greek accent was musical to an extent that Latin was not.

These passages are usually interpreted as referring to the recitative chant mentioned by Quintilian (XI. 3, 57); that chant, however, was in monotone (*syntonorum modis*, Quintilian, IX. 4, 142), and would hardly be described by the phrases cited from Petronius. Furthermore, it had been in vogue so long by Nero's day and was so common that Petronius would not have chosen it as a peculiarly amusing characteristic of his freedmen.

(b) While speaking of the Latin accent, I wish to add a second observation that touches the same question, though more remotely. It is very often charged that Cicero, Varro, and Quintilian must have been singularly obtuse not to notice that the Latin accent was one of stress, if such was actually the case. Furthermore, there are scholars who refuse to believe in a stress accent because of the explicit statements of Cicero, Varro, and the grammarians to the contrary. Such scholars seem to me to expect entirely too much acumen on the part of the Romans. Latin grammarians were wont to accept the rules of the Greek grammars if they applied approximately well to their own language. In the case of accent, they undoubtedly applied as far as they went, though their application extended only to the accessory variation of pitch, and not to the more fundamental stress accent. But, considering that to all practical purposes the rules *did* apply, are we not requiring too much when we demand that the Romans should have delved below the surface of so workable a rule? I believe that we are, and I have come to this belief by noticing some parallel cases of misapplication of accent rules.

Almost all of the early grammarians of the modern languages have done precisely what the Latin grammarians did—that is, they have applied the rules of pitch accent as found in the Latin grammars to their respective vernaculars without noticing any particular discrepancies. There is no doubt, for instance, that the English accent is expiratory, and yet there was enough of the musical element in the language to make the ancient rules appear

satisfactory
without cri

Putten
to give un
highest lift
sharpe accen
wordes,' etc
the short a
See further
tune'), in S
Surely Ben
obtuse. A
as they ha
The very
confronted
(Deutsche V
him, it was
to approac
escaped no
not charge
the other l

Bryn Ma

satisfactory to early grammarians, who forthwith adopted and applied them without criticism. Note the following characteristic passages:

Puttenham II. 7 (1589) writes: 'It caused them (the Greeks and Latins) to give unto three different sounds, three several names: to that which was *highest lift up* and *most elevate* or *shrillest* in the eare they gave the name of the *sharpe accent* . . . all this by good observation we may perceive in our vulgar wordes,' etc. Cf. also Samuel Daniel, *A Defense of Rhyme* (about 1603): 'As the short and long make number, so the *acute* and *grave* accent make rhythm.' See further instances in Ben Jonson's *Grammar* (1637, 'in accent which is *tune*'), in Stanyhurst's prologue to his translation of *Aeneid* I.-IV. (1582), et al. Surely Ben Jonson, Daniel, and Puttenham cannot be considered singularly obtuse. Ancient authority gave them rules that seemed sufficient for English as they had formerly seemed sufficient for Latin, and they adopted them. The very same thing occurred when the early German grammarians were confronted with the problem of defining the nature of their accent. Saran (*Deutsche Verslehre*, p. 10 ff.) cites several of these to the point. According to him, it was not till 1816, in the work of Scoppa, that these definitions began to approach correctness. My point is then that, since the stress accent escaped notice for so long a time even among modern grammarians, we need not charge the Romans with unusual obtuseness for failing to find it, nor, on the other hand, deny its existence in Latin by argumentum ex silentio.

TENNEY FRANK.

Bryn Mawr.

THE 'CODEX LEIDENSIS' OF LIVY.

For the purposes of the new text of Livy which Professor Conway and Professor C. F. Walters are preparing for the Oxford Series of Classical Texts, I undertook in 1908 to examine the *Codex Leidensis*, which contains Livy's first decade.

By the courtesy of Dr. S. G. Vries, Librarian, and Dr. Molhuysen, Keeper of the Manuscripts in the University of Leiden, who first gave me access to the MS. in their University Library, and afterwards lent it for my purposes to the University of Manchester, I was enabled to collate L in all points where the Nicomachean Codices showed any divergence of the least importance from one another or from the Veronensis, using for this purpose the notes of readings lent to me by Professors Conway and Walters. Their references to chapters and sections follow Madvig's third edition; but, except where some other authority is quoted, as Drakenborch in Table C below, the reading which I have given first is the *lemma* of the unpublished text of Conway and Walters, which does not necessarily agree with Madvig.

Of the early history of the MS. I have found no record. Drakenborch himself first saw it in 1714. It was subsequently sold by auction at the Hague to Samuel Hulf, from whom Peter Burmann bought it in 1730 for the University of Leiden, where it was collated by Drakenborch, according to the library record, '*Contulit Drakenborchius*,' and his own statement, '*Usui meo concessus praeclarum huius editionis ornamentum est*' (Drak. vol. vii. p. 323). Part of it was collated by Th. Mommsen when he was editing the Veronese palimpsest, and it has also been consulted by Frigell, Kiehl, and Deiter.

The MS., which is ascribed to the eleventh or twelfth century,¹ consists of 103 folia, 42 lines to a page, in a minuscule hand; and well deserves its description in the catalogue, *nitide scriptus*.

Wrong division of words is extraordinarily frequent in it; the punctuation also is so erratic as to be quite valueless. Capital letters are generally used at the beginning of sentences (according to L's punctuation), but not, as a rule, for proper names. From these faults the recto of fol. 1, which, whether by the same or a different hand, is more boldly written than the rest, is on the whole free. Two other common errors are especially frequent in L—the omission of the cedilla, which transforms *e* into the diphthong *æ*, and the

¹ '*Codex Membranaceus XI.-XII. saec.*' (MS. note by a modern librarian inside cover of the MS. itself.)

omission of
thus *uulsc*
Vcientes we
Obtinus is
damno, dan
Porsenna,
times we fi

As in
before i, fo
we have c
pacior, nur

A per
SOC (*sen*
more regu
in other M
Abbreviat
Latin Tex
and Prou,

Tyber
GLOS
taining su
hand ma
(Bk. III.
marginal
possible i
acter. T
fratris. .

Inter
tardantem
INCO
have bee
quoted i
natum.

DIS
of Book
infra, Ta
SUB
of the M
machi.³
M and
SIG

¹ The d
MSS. of t
Here

omission or wrong insertion of the sign ~ for *m*. The spelling is not uniform; thus *uulsci* and *uolsci* alternate freely, even within the same chapter; for *Vcientes* we often get *Vehientes*, and sometimes *Veihentes* and even *Venientes*. *Optimus* is not uncommon, and *dampno*, *dampnum* occur side by side with *damno*, *damnum*. On the other hand, *L* is fairly consistent in the spelling of *Porseenna*, a name which occurs frequently in Book II., though two or three times we find *Porsinna*.

As in other Latin MSS. of this epoch (tenth to twelfth century) *t* (especially before *i*, followed by another vowel) is frequently confused with *c*. Thus, e.g., we have on the one hand *t* for *c* in *inditium*, *Lutius*, and *c* for *t* in *sedicio*, *facior*, *nuncius*.

A peculiarity of *L* is the misplacing of a letter in the abbreviations *SOC* (*senatus consulto*), and *SMC* (*senatus consultum*), which alternate with the more regular *SC*.¹ I have not found this transposition mentioned as occurring in other MSS., though on this point I have consulted Cappelli, *Dizionario di Abbreviature*; Chassant, *Dictionnaire des Abréviations*; Lindsay, *Introduction to Latin Textual Emendation and Contractions in Early Latin Minuscule Manuscripts*; and Prou, *Manuel de Paléographie*.

Tyberis is always spelt with a *y*, which is always dotted.¹

GLOSSES.—*L* originally contained a large number of marginal glosses, containing summaries of the text—e.g. at the beginning of Book IV. on the right-hand margin are the words *consi novi* (*Consules novi*), and on fol. 36 line 17 (Bk. III. 68) there remains *consul qd de iuventute ꝑcipiant*. Nearly all these marginalia were subsequently erased, but, in spite of the erasure, it is still possible in some cases to decipher them sufficiently to see their general character. Thus on fol. 2 (Bk. I. ch. iv.) we may read <Am>ulius regnat . . . fratris. . . .

Interlinear glosses are very rare, but a specimen is (fol. 36) *dubitantem, tardantem*, written over *cunctantem*.

INCORPORATED GLOSSES.—A certain number of glosses of the former kind have been incorporated in the text—noticeably the '*Secum demptius*,' etc., quoted *infra* Table C, Bk. VIII. 9. 12, and Bk. V. 54, for *natum uni[ce locum]*, *natum*. *Uniquoto anno a Gallis roma uastata sit*² (Table C).

DISLOCATIONS.—The most remarkable dislocation of the text is at the end of Book V., where chs. lii.-lv. are omitted, to be inserted after Bk. VI. 2 (see *infra*, Table C). This passage appears in *H* in its proper place.

SUBSCRIPTIONES.—The codex contains prefaces and postscripts to several of the books, referring to recensions of the text by the family of the Symmachi.³ These notes are in very corrupt form, but are similar to those in *M* and *H*.

SIGLA.—For convenience we may divide the MS. into two parts, *a* foll.

¹ The dotted *y* is of common occurrence in MSS. of this period.

Here *H* omits *unice*——*urbis*.

³ Mentioned in letters of Q. Aurelius Symmachus (end of fourth cent. A.D.).

1-56 (Books I.-V.) and β foll. 57-103 (Books VI.-X.); certain differences in the sigla and the writing seem to indicate that α and β are not contemporary.¹

et. The siglum & occurs very frequently throughout.

est is represented by \tilde{e} or \approx indifferently in α ; in β , \tilde{e} is almost universal: I have noted \approx only twice (fol. 82 and fol. 103), in both cases at the end of a line and beyond the usual alignment, so that it might be a subsequent addition.²

eset. & & is common in α and not uncommon in β , though in the latter we often find the form $e\tilde{e}$, which does not occur in α .

esse is regularly $e\tilde{e}$ in α ; on fol. 57 we have $e\tilde{e}$, and so usually to the end.

\tilde{u} (uero), \tilde{m} (modo), and \tilde{g} (igitur) are common in both halves of the MS.

FORMS OF LETTERS.—Fol. 57 is remarkable for the very frequent occurrence of the open form of the letter a , sometimes almost like u . Hitherto it had been very rare, occurring occasionally in \tilde{p} , a variant of \tilde{p} (*prae*), and (chiefly at the end of a word) rarely in foll. 7-14, but not, I believe, elsewhere in α . On fol. 57 examples are very numerous, and in the rest of β it is found frequently, though not to the exclusion of the ordinary forms of the letter, α and a .

In other ways the writing of β seems to be different from that of α . A further peculiarity is the occurrence of initial capital letters *extra lineam* on the left margin, and in some of the folia of β we find some exceptionally long cursive forms of the letters s and t , and a large S which is a ligature of us at the end of a word.

Thus the differences in the commonest sigla make for the theory that the two halves of the codex are to some extent independent, and the fact, that while Book V. ends with the *Subscriptio* of Nicomachus at the end of fol. 56, Book VI. on the next fol. begins with a repetition (in a form showing some new corruptions) of the same *Subscriptio*, is another piece of evidence on the same side.³ That the two halves are not, however, derived entirely from independent sources, is shown by the fact that a long passage omitted from fol. 56 is inserted on fol. 58. We must therefore assume that the dislocation already existed in the exemplar from which both α (Books I.-V.) and β (Books VI.-X.) were copied. It may have been due to the misplacing of a folium in that exemplar or some earlier MS.⁴

IMPORTANCE OF H AND L.—All critics, from Drakenborch to the present

¹ Dianu, in his study of *Codex Thuanus* (Introduction, p. 6), notes that this division into half decades was not infrequent.

² Lindsay (*Contractions in early Latin minuscule MSS.*) mentions \tilde{e} , $e\tilde{e}$, and $e\tilde{e}t$ as *Notae Juris*—really preminuscule contractions, which were gradually superseded.

³ At the bottom of fol. 56 (*verso*):

TITI LI VII NICOMACHVS DEXTERVM EMNDARI
AD EXEMPLVM PARENTIS MEI CLEMENTIANI AB
VRBE COND VICTORIANVS EMENDABAM DOMNIS
SIMMACHIS LIBER. V. EXPLICIT.

At the top of fol. 57 (*recto*):

TITI LIVII TINCOMACHVS DEXTERVM EMENDARI
AD EXEMPLVM PARENTIS MEI CLEMENTIANI AB VRBE
COND VICTORIANVS EMENDABAM DOMNIS SYM-
MACHIS. LIBER QVINTVS EXPLICIT.

INCIPIIT LIBER VI.

⁴ Professor Walters has noted the same dislocation in D at this point; but it does not appear in H, nor has it been noted in any other MS., though there is some evidence of corruption: vide Drak's note, cited in Table C, *ad loc.*

generation, s
Drakenborch
him by Casle
he knew littl

Professo
showed from
much better
even in Book
has been exa

But the
relation to c
view of the
the inferiori
the MS. evic

On the
Leidensis.

Knowle
basis of gro
of the close
and Frigell
advantage
of F (Book
not only on

RELAT
of the relat
where eithe
agree in on
importance
independen
only some,

In H
vising edito
to correct
allocutionis

is nearer to
H's predece
name, whe
Such
The i

¹ *Ipsi* hav
L₁ et H₁, qu
mendis com
propagatis i
pp. 321-322.
computed th

generation, seem to have tacitly assumed the practical identity of L with H.¹ Drakenborch himself collated the *Leidensis*; the *Harleianus* was collated for him by Casley of the British Museum, and these two were his best material, as he knew little of M, nothing of P, and next to nothing of T.

Professor Walters, however (Camb. Phil. Soc., *Proc.*, October 30, 1902), showed from his own collation of H that in Books I.-V., at any rate, H was much better than had been supposed, and cannot be coupled with L; and that even in Books VI.-VIII. the close degree of the relationship between H and L has been exaggerated (cf. *Classical Quarterly*, July, 1908).

But the exact relation of L to H was not yet determined; still less its relation to other MSS. of the first decade. These relations are important in view of the fact that Books IX., X. are wanting in H, and, further, because of the inferiority of M in some parts of Books VI.-X.; and, generally, because the MS. evidence for VI.-X. is not quite the same as for I.-V.

On these grounds we cannot afford to neglect the authority of the *Leidensis*.

Knowledge of the first decade is now more accessible, and we have a better basis of grouping before us, thanks to Dianu's collation of T and his account of the close relation between T and H, and to Häggström's collation of U, and Frigell's collation of various MSS. of Books I.-III. I have also had the advantage of private access to Walters' collation of H (Books I.-VIII.) and of F (Books IX., X.), as well as to Conway and Walters' extensive notes, not only on MPHL, but also on FOTDA.

RELATION OF L TO H.—With a view to the study of the exact nature of the relationship between H and L, I have collected a number of passages where either one of the two omits words which occur in the other, or the two agree in omissions. Both the resemblances and the differences are of some importance: the differences as indicating the extent to which H and L are independent of each other; the resemblances as tending to show that some, but only some, of their mistakes have a common origin.

In H we find a certain number of peculiarities obviously due to the supervising editor in some previous exemplar, who has made unsuccessful attempts to correct a corrupt text. Thus in V. 52. 11, for *Aio Locutio Templum* H gives *allocutionis templum*; whereas L, preserving the meaningless *allocutio templum*, is nearer to the original. Again, in II. 33. 9, *Postumum Cominium bellum gessisse*, H's predecessor substituted the familiar *comminus* for the less familiar proper name, where L retains the corrupt *comminius*, to the detriment of grammar.

Such corrections as those of H are not frequent in L.

The insertions in L are due either to simple dittography or to the

¹ 'Ipsi haud dubie inter bonos et praestantes L₁ et H₁, qui quam sint cognati ex eiusmodi mendis communibus nec ad ullos praeterea propagatis intelligi potest.' Drak. vol. vii. pp. 321-322. Drakenborch, writing in 1746, computed the age of H at seven or eight

centuries, and of L at six or seven centuries, and he ranks L as second only to the Florentinus (M), *vide* Drak., *loc. cit.* H is now assigned by the British Museum authorities to the tenth century, L by the Leiden authorities to the eleventh or twelfth century.

incorporation of glosses; not, so far as I could judge, to any independent tradition.

The various tables appended below give cumulative evidence for my conclusions on the relationship of the two MSS., which may thus be stated:

(i.) Of the family to which H and L are assumed to belong, H comes from an older branch; for H does not show the dislocation in Books V. and VI., and H has the text complete in many places where L has omissions.

(ii.) L is *not* a copy of H, for L is often complete where H has omissions; e.g. particularly in III. 72. 2, where H omits about three-quarters of a chapter.

(iii.) H and L are nevertheless closely related, for they have (1) many minor omissions in common, and (2) some incorporations in common (e.g. VIII. 9. 12, *Secum demptius*, etc., Table C.).

Many variations of reading between the two might have been accounted for as divergences caused by the misreading or miscorrection of the same exemplar by two quite independent copyists. But one exception is very important—namely, the dislocation at V. 52 in L. I have already given my reasons for believing that this dislocation existed in L's exemplar; but if it had existed in H's exemplar, it is a reasonable supposition either that it would have been reproduced by H's scribe, or that the restoration to the proper order would have left some trace in H—e.g. at least a small dittography. Therefore I believe that L's exemplar was closely related to that of H, being perhaps a copy of the same archetype, but differed from it at least in this point.

TABLE A.

SOME EXAMPLES OF OMISSIONS IN H AND L.¹

Book I.			
7. 12. Herculi—dapemque	om. HLRDO.	36. 5. ira . . .	HO, om. LRD.
23. 8. hoc magis scis . . .	HO, om. L.	41. 6. habeant . . .	O (aberant DL), om. H.
24. 6. is patrem . . .	is om. HLRD.	41. 7. et intercessor . . .	HO, om. RDL.
26. 9. iure caesum filium . . .	L, om. H.	44. 5. eorum . . .	HO, om. RDL.
27. 5. hostem . . .	H, om. L.	46. 1. pugnarin . . .	LOR, om. H.
36. 4. rem . . .	L, om. H.	52. 2. in uniuersos . . .	H, in om. RLD.
39. 6. ut in domo . . .	ut, om. HL.	56. 6-7. auctor—aetatis eius . . .	H, om. L.
45. 5. immolasset — fani Dianae . . .	L, om. H.	64. 3. cum caedes . . .	LO, cum om. H.
47. 1. ad aliud . . .	H, om. LRD.	65. 4. sic . . .	HO, om. RDL.
59. 1. ui . . .	H, om. L.		
56. 4. anxiis . . .	om. HLR.		
Book II.		Book III.	
1. 1. ab se auctae . . .	HRO, se om. L.	2. 8. hoc est . . .	LO, est om. H.
1. 4. quid enim . . .	LO, enim om. H.	5. 9. hostium . . .	LO, om. H.
14. 6. concitato . . .	L, om. H.	5. 10. minor caedes—impetum dedit . . .	L, om. H.
17. 6. quam ob . . . Cominium . . .	L, om. H.	6. 8. patrum . . .	H, om. L.
18. 11. praestare—erat . . .	LO, om. H.	14. 4. cum ingenti . . .	LO, cum om. H.
23. 2. et inter . . .	H, et om. LRD.	18. 3. id poscere—ciuitatem . . .	LOD, om. H.
		20. 3. iurastis . . .	LO, om. H.

¹ For an account of the chief MSS. referred to, see Professor Walters' article in the *Classical Quarterly*, July, 1908.

26. 12. et imperi—rata . . . LRDO, om. H.
 38. 6. tentationemque . . . HO, -que om. RDL.
 41. 6. ad consules . . . LO, ad om. H.
 45. 2. in libertatem . . . HO, in om. RL.
 51. 3. cum id enim . . . LO, cum om. H.
 54. 12. qui . . . HO, om. L.
 56. 6. dictae . . . HO, om. RDL.
 56. 11. quod si . . . HO, si om. RL.
 59. 4. fuissent ut . . . LO, ut om. H.
 61. 13. pauci recursant-
 esque . . . HAO, om. L.
 64. 10. quos hi sibi . . . hi om. HRLAO.
 71. 3. dicere . . . HOA, om. RL.
 72. 2. omnia post exemplo ad usque ad libri huius
 finem om. H. (i.e.—three-quarters of a
 chapter), retinet L.

BOOK IV.

2. 12. hostes tantum ar-
 cessissent—hostes
 tantum non pati-
 antur . . . L, hostes tantum
 non patiantur H.
 3. 10. patribus auctoribus
 4. 1. uero . . . auctoribus om. HL.
 L, om. H.
 4. 10. eodem itinere eat
 ne idem conuiuium
 L, itinere—idem
 om. H.
 6. 4. res . . . L, om. H.
 9. 3. ex domo—iuuenem
 L, om. H.
 12. 6. Proculo . . . O, om. HL.
 14. 3. ad senatum . . . LAO, om. H.
 17. 6. summouere—anie-
 nem . . . L, om. H.
 20. 3. quae prima . . . HO, om. L.
 21. 10. alii alia . . . L, alia om. H.
 23. 2. tribunos militum
 L, militum om. H.
 25. 3. quoque—implicitis
 L, om. H.
 28. 3. circumuenti igitur
 H, igitur om. L.
 33. 4. signa . . . H, om. L.
 35. 9. uirum . . . H, om. L.
 38. 3. uexillo cuspidem—
 ullos equites . . . L, uexillos equites
 H.
 40. 4. diem dixerant . . . H, diem om. L.
 43. 10. unde si quid . . .
 non exercitum . . . H, unde—non om.
 L.
 44. 1. habita . . . Cincin-
 natus . . . H, om. L.
 46. 5. ductu L. Sergii
 cuius . . . H, ducti L. cuius
 L.
 54. 3. P. Aelius . . . H, om. L.
 56. 13. ui atque . . . om. HL.
 58. 2. tantum auit . . . H, tantum, om. L.

BOOK V.

6. 4. ut hiemem . . . LO, om. H.
 8. 1. Q. Pulupiciu A. . .
 om. et alieno loco
 inser., HL.
 11. 4. et qui . . . LO, qui om. H.
 12. 13. missumque . . . O, que om. HLA.
 18. 7. praecipitauer se . . . HOA, se om. L.
 20. 5. altera . . . HOA, om. L.

24. 10. urbis . . . HO, om. LA.
 29. 2. ulii . . . H, om. L.
 36. 11. haud secus . . . LAO, haud om. H.
 36. 12. quarto . . . LAO, om. H.
 P. Seruilius . . . LAO, om. H.
 37. 2. aut . . . LAO, om. H.
 39. 2. ubi cum . . . LAO, cum om. H.
 46. 6. et Caedicius . . . O, om. HL.
 52. 5. Sacerdotes nostros
 LAO, om. H.
 53. 9. nouam . . . LAO, om. H.
 54. 5. argumento—urbis . . .
 O, om. HL.

BOOK VI.

4. 9. ad Cortuosam . . . T, om. HL.
 6. 3. res . . . HT, om. L.
 6. 4. iuuentutem . . . LT, om. H.
 9. 5. quibus Seruilius . . . HT, om. L.
 9. 6. erat . . . HT, om. L.
 18. 4. quod—dictator . . . LTDO, om. H.
 18. 6. singuli—essetis . . . om. HLTAD.
 18. 12. duces—qualescum-
 que . . . LDO, om. H.
 21. 6. et magna . . . LDO, om. H.
 21. 9. ita placide—respon-
 sum est . . . O, om. HLTAD.
 22. 8. haud quaquam . . . LTDOA, haud om.
 H.
 36. 11. uix . . . O, om. HLTAD.

BOOK VII.

5. 5. accusandi . . . LTDO, om. H.
 5. 6. illum praeualidum
 iuuenem . . . LTD, om. H.
 O, om. HLTDA.
 5. 7. erat . . . LTDO, om. H.
 13. 11. ut signum—iuberet
 LTDO, om. H.
 16. 9. decem . . . O, om. HLTDA.
 24. 9. tumulis—exercitum
 O, om. HLTDA.
 25. 9. hae . . . LTD, om. H.
 27. 1. ciuitatem—imperare
 om. L. only.
 adorta—imperare . . . om. T.
 ciuitatem (only) . . . om. H only.
 adorta—Xuiris . . . om. D only.
 28. 8. supplicatum—die . . . LT, om. H.
 30. 2. subiecti—nunc . . . om. HL.
 30. 6. uestrum . . . LT, om. H.
 31. 9. pro—parcerent . . . om. HLTDA.
 34. 4. arx . . . O, om. HLTDA.
 38. 7. labem—agitata . . . HTAO, om. L.
 40. 9. neum . . . om. HLTDA.

BOOK VIII.

1. 1. iam consules—Ma-
 mercus . . . LT, om. H.
 2. 1. senatum—praetor . . . HT, om. L.
 9. 4. ope . . . HTDAO, om. L.
 10. 13. sine hostia—uolet . . . O, om. HLTDA.
 11. 12. deditionem—Latinus
 LTLO, om. H.
 12. 13. aduersas—dictato-
 rem . . . om. HLTDA.
 12. 14. aduersas—plebi . . . om. HLTDA.
 20. 9. mansisset . . . HT, om. L.
 25. 13. milia . . . T, om. HLA.
 30. 4. que profectus ad
 Imbrinium . . . HT, om. L.; Imbri-
 nium om. DA.
 33. 19. quo ultra—fuisse . . . om. HLT.

From these examples it appears that—(1) L often omits words which H retains, and *vice-versâ*, while the support of R and D is now on one side, now on the other; (2) where T is available, H is hardly ever in agreement with L alone as against T. It is therefore worth while to compare L with T in the matter of omissions in Books IX., X.

TABLE B.

OMISSIONS IN T AND L.

Book IX.			
8. 3.	haud sum ignarus		
	—paci	T, om. L.	
9. 17.	nec cum—egestis	OTP, om. LDA.	
11. 11.	esse—Romanum	PFOT, om. LDA.	
22. 9.	dederunt—maeroris	OMPFUT, om. LD.	
24. 2.	periculo	TD, om. L.	
24. 14.	imposito—Romam	OT, om. DLA.	
36. 11.	militis—abacta	om. LDAT.	
41. 11.	expertis—incolerent	OMP, om. LDAT.	
44. 2.	T or Ti	MP, om. LDAT.	
46. 8-9.	plebeiae—consensumque	LD, om. T.	
BOOK X.			
1. 1.	milis	L, om. PFUT.	
3. 6.	Romam	T, om. LU.	
6. 6.	quinque	T, om. DL.	
7. 10.	per urbem	PFUOM, om. TLDA.	
	lituo	PFO, om. TLDA.	
11. 1.	prouincia Etruria	M, om. PFUO	
		TLDA.	
18. 3.	perlatus est	PFUO, est om. TLDA.	
19. 12.	exciret—castris	TL, om. DA.	
22. 1.	nemini—vincebatur	DL, om. PFU.	
	nemini—quintum	om. T.	
25. 10.	siebant—exacta	MP, om. TDLA.	
26. 2.	experti—coniungi	om. LT.	
37. 6.	uideretque—exisset	DL, om. T.	
38. 2.	opes	T, om. DL.	
41. 7.	Romanos—uox etiam	TD, om. L.	
45. 14.	Caesi	T, om. DL.	

From these examples it would seem that L has numerous omissions of words which T retains; there are certain omissions common to both, and some few cases in which L retains words omitted by T. In this last class, as in omissions, L is generally in agreement with D. These results strongly support the conclusions as to the grouping of the MSS. set forth by Professor Walters in the *Classical Quarterly*, July, 1908.

PREVIOUS COLLATIONS.—In about seventy places I have been able to correct or add to Drakenborch's collation (Drakenborch's Edition, Leiden, 1738). Considering the vastness of the task which Drakenborch accomplished, it is surprising that the corrections are so few and so unimportant as they are. The one striking omission on his part is his silence as to the transposition at the end of Book V. The list might be greatly increased if notice were taken of such trivialities as the writing of *e* for *ae*, *a* for *ae*, *ae* for *oe*, and other small errors which occur passim in L; while to note all the cases where words are wrongly divided would be a labour unprofitable and unending. Such minor variations have only been included where they were referred to by Drakenborch. In VI. 4. 9. Mommsen gives L's reading as *direpta*, whereas it is really *dirupta*; but this is the only inaccuracy which I have noticed in his citations of L.

Drakenborch's

5. 1. debino

7. 12. sollem

13. 4. mouer

b

15. 1. simul

39. 3. uiden

46. 7. iungi

50. indixe

53. 6. neq.

57. 7. quin

text;

1. 3. ab s

(Dr.

note).

2. 7. memi

(Dr.

note).

7. 10. cedere

note).

12. 12. infens

8. 5. Gabin

9. Teren

12. 4. nemin

esse

13. 3. abfue

21. 7. inuid

quad

26. 7. uerte

uert

28. 9. infens

plid

39. 7. in lib

plid

51. 4. quam

40. 13. refer

51. 7. immi

per

Coll

12. 9. extru

18. 7. emit

19. 2. cogn

23. 1. Q. T

plid

31. 9. ab ei

32. 3. M.

33. 4. acuu

33. 9. liber

habi

44. cins

note

Book I.

<i>Drakenborch's Collation.</i>	<i>My Collation.</i>
5. 1. dehinc.	dein.
7. 12. sollempnium.	eo sollempnium.
13. 4. mouent.	moues.
ba	ba
15. 1. simulat.	simulat.
39. 3. uiden.	uidine.
46. 7. iungi aut.	iungi ut.
50. indixerat.	dixerat.
53. 6. neq.	nequam.
57. 7. quin si (<i>Dr.'s</i> text: no note).	quis.

1. 3. ab se auctae ab auctae.
(Dr.'s text; no note).

2. 7. meminimus me minus.
(Dr.'s text; no note).

8. 5. Gabinumque.	Gabinumque.
9. Terentilius.	Terentilius.
12. 4. neminem unum	nē in ē in unū ^{ss} ē cui'.
esse cuius.	
13. 3. abfuerit (<i>no note</i>).	affuerit.
17. 1. inuidiamque	inuidiam quaeq.
quae (<i>implied</i>).	
26. 7. uerterat L ₁ ;	uerterat L ₁ ; euerterat
uerterat L ₂ .	L ₂ .
28. 9. infensus (<i>im-</i>	insensus.
<i>plied</i>).	
39. 7. in libertate (<i>im-</i>	libertate.
<i>plied</i>).	
51. 4. quam quae	quamq.
40. 13. referent.	referent; <i>corr. ipse to</i>
	<i>-ant.</i>
51. 7. imminensque	imminensque et ppor-
per portam	tam.
Collinam.	

12. 9. extruria.	exuria.
18. 7. emittit.	emisit.
19. 2. cognosceret.	cognosceret.
23. 1. Q. Tubero (<i>im- plied</i>).	Q. tuū (= tuero).
31. 9. ab eis.	a Veis.
32. 3. M.	Mam.
33. 4. accuunt.	accurrit.
33. 9. liberis frenis.	liberi frenas.
44. habita . . . Cin- cinnatus (<i>not noted</i>).	om. L.

46. 5. ductu L. cuius.
51. 2. praeficeret (*implied*).
56. 12. respublica (*implied*).

7. 5. concilio.	contilio.
22. 7. uocauerat.	uocauerant.
34. 7. Salum.	saluam.
41. 10. Ignes (<i>not noted</i>).	hymnis.
46. 10. acceptos de.	a acceptos de.
52. 8. <i>No note on L's reading, but Dr. observs, 'Sacra in Lovel, a religiosum fuit in Frag. Hav. perperam deficitum.'</i>	<i>After transferri sacra, L. continues at 55. 2, qua uoce audita et senatus. . . Ch. 52 is continued, religiosum fuit et seq. after two chapters of Book VI. . . speratam minime largitore duce.</i>
54. 3. natum unijce locum] <i>not noted, but implied by reading of text</i> .	<i>L. has natum uniuotato anno a Gallis Romauastata sit (an incorporated gloss).</i>
54. 5. argumento.	argumento—urbis, om. L. (also H).

4. 7. Iulius Iulus.	Iulus Tullus (so Mommsen L).
4. 9. dirupta (<i>rightly</i>), and diruta (<i>wrongly</i>). for <i>Dr. quotes L twice</i> . direpta Mom.	dirupta.
5. 7. creati hi.	creati hii.
12. 2. assidua.	assidue.

17. 10. Seruilius (*implied*). SeR iulius (=Seruius
Julius).
18. 2. Em epulum. ē epulum (=est epu-
lum).

22. 3 (for abiit) habet habitet.
et.
27. 1. civitatem. om, L.
29. 1. Reading not noted. Et uiri

31. 9. *Not noted.* longinquitate vel reli-
gionum vel templo-
rum spatio.
After agrum qui PR L
inserts from below and
crosses out senatusq.
uerbis—agro.

BOOK VIII.

<i>Drakenborch's Collation.</i>	<i>My Collation.</i>
2. 1. (<i>Not noted, though Drak. notes the omission in Haverk.</i>)	senatum—praetor om. L.
9. 9. Insilit Leid i.; Insiluit Leid pr. (<i>meaning?</i>)	insilit.
9. 12. <i>after</i> euidentiū id fuit <i>Drak. notes an insertion by H and L correctly (as over), except that he gives Decius for L's Demp-tius.</i>	pauorem ac fugam hos-tium secum demptius circumferens cadit moxque consternatio et conversio latini exercitus. <i>This is an incorporated gloss. The origin of demptius is that some scribe wrote Detius for Decius (as frequently), and added P̄ for Publius (L. generally puts this mark over initials of proper names). Later the p̄ was written in the word, and finally deptius was expanded to demptius.</i>
14. 6. eis.	cis.
16. 6. pauidos (<i>implied</i>).	pauido.
11. sc om. L.	ex se consulto.

THE UNIVERSITY,
MANCHESTER.
January, 1910.

BOOK IX.

<i>Drakenborch's Collation.</i>	<i>My Collation.</i>
8. 15. posse.	possent.
9. 16. (<i>not noted</i>) hostis an ciuis.	hostis Ancius.
11. 4. tunc sponsio (<i>implied</i>).	tum sponsio.
17. 8. Pubilium.	Publium.
24. 14. et infandae.	et om.
25. 5. Samnites.	Samnitem.
33. 9. ad ius ratumque.	ad ius ratum.
34. 10. centum.	certum.
41. 3. ea.	ēā.

BOOK X.

14. 1. P. Decius Mus. (<i>not noted</i>).	et P. et D. decius Mus.
23. 3. quae (<i>implied</i>).	q. (=que).
24. comitio habuit.	comitia habuit (<i>the h is probably an insertion</i>).
28. 4. eorum proelia.	eorum esse proelia.
28. 12. uociferare.	uociferare se.
33. 4. agunt.	cogunt.
45. 1. contione (<i>implied</i>).	contentioni.
4. et uastari.	ac uastari.
47. 5. gurgitem (<i>not noted</i>).	gurgitem.

J. F. DOBSON.

Now the
of civil war
the victory
Philippi in
arma,' seem
Cleopatrae
patus femin
demands of
but there is
'supremas
meaning.
A femin
been absorb

By an inte
and Proper
the foundin
of empire
'quot aute
apud Varr
fuisse Vett
in discept

CARM. BVCOL. EINSIDL. II 34.

(ANTH. LAT. RIES. 726, P.L.M. BAEHR. III P. 64.)

nec gladio metimus nec clausis oppida muris
bella tacenda parant; nullo iam noxia partu
femina, quaecumque est, hostem parit. arua iuuentus
nuda fodit, tardoque puer domifactus aratro 30
miratur patriis pendentem sedibus ensem.
sed procul a nobis infelix gloria Sullae
trinaque tempestas, moriens cum Roma supremas
desperavit — et Martia uendidit arma.

Now that Nero reigns and the golden age is come anew, there is no fear of civil warfare. But the peace prevailing is not the repression which followed the victory of Sulla, nor the exhaustion and dishonour of the years after Philippi in the time of the triumvirate. The last words, 'Martia uendidit arma,' seem to be rightly explained by Mr Riese as 'tradidit externae feminae Cleopatrae': Horace *epod.* ix 11-13 says similarly 'Romanus . . . emancipatus feminae | fert uallum et arma miles.' In the preceding phrase the demands of metre and grammar are satisfied by Peiper's insertion of <opes>; but there is no apparent reason why this word should have been lost, and 'supremas desperavit opes' is an expression to which I can attach no particular meaning.

A feminine plural noun of iambic scansion which would most easily have been absorbed by *-auit* will provide just the sense required:

moriens cum Roma supremas
desperavit <auis> et Martia uendidit arma.

By an interpretation at least as old as Varro the 'Palatinae aues,' as Ovid and Propertius call them, the twelve vultures which appeared to Romulus at the founding of Rome, were supposed to typify twelve centuries of existence or of empire vouchsafed by destiny to the new city. Censorinus *de die nat.* 17 15 'quot autem saecula urbi Romae debeantur dicere meum non est; sed quid apud Varronem legerim non tacebo, qui libro antiquitatum duodeicensimo ait fuisse Vettium Romae in augurio non ignobilem, ingenio magno, cuius doctori in disceptando parem: eum se audisse dicentem, si ita esset ut traderent

historici de Romuli urbis condendae auguriis ac xii uulturiis, quoniam cxx annos incolumis praeteriisset populus Romanus, ad mille et ducentos peruentum.' The assassination of Aetius by Valentinian in A.D. 454, when the 1200 years had just run out, is thus recorded by Apollinaris Sidonius *carm.* vii 357-9: 'iam prope fata tui bis senas uulturis alas | complebant (scis namque tuos, scis, Roma, labores): | Aetium Placidus mactauit semiuir amens.' What the bucolic poet says is therefore this: that Rome at the beginning of her eighth century believed her end to be at hand, and resigned all hope of seeing the centuries which were still wanting to make up the tale of twelve and fulfil the prophecy of the vultures. The augurs despaired less prematurely in A.D. 401 at the approach of Alaric: Claud. *bell. Poll.* 265 sq. 'tunc reputant annos, interceptoque uolatu | uulturis incidunt properatis saecula metis.'

A. E. HOUSMAN.

THIR
century
in 1832.
has been
books, th
to be fo
correcte
textual
present
almost
Arseni
When a
these te
The
lative, a
to carel
the pag
χαλεπω
should
502 the
σοφώτερ
looking
γηράσκε
149 ποῖ
Pre
(Alexan
265 ἐγώ
οὐ λοιδο
420 πα
ἀπάρσε
Sm
τατον.
τοὺς β
346 ἀν
NO. 1

ARSENII VIOLETVM.

THIS medley of proverbs, stories, and sayings, put together by a fifteenth-century archbishop, was edited by Walz, then engaged on the *Rhetores Graeci*, in 1832. It has not appeared again since and, as far as I know, little attention has been paid to it, though in addition to much that is contained also in other books, the *Paroemiographi*, *Stobaeus*, *Diogenes*, etc., it has a good deal not to be found elsewhere. The text of these latter parts has been but little corrected, and that is why I am noticing it now. From the point of view of textual criticism the following notes, which I have made very brief, may present some interest, because they will show over again the working of certain almost uniform tendencies to error which beset Greek books. The cases in *Arsenius* are often unusually clear, and for that reason are worth pointing out. When a critic of *Demosthenes* or *Plato* assumes and proceeds upon one of these tendencies, the general reader doubts its existence.

There are eight or ten cases of the comparative adjective for the superlative, and one or two the other way. In the eight or ten I ascribe the fault to careless copying rather than change of idiom. My references are to the pages of Walz. *πρεσβύτερον* 100, *μακαριώτερον* 107, *βαρύτερον* 208, *χαλεπωτέρα* 209, *έπισημότερος* 254, *χαλεπωτερός* 507, *πλουσιώτερος* 510. 189 should probably be *φανυλοτέραν τήν υπόκρισιν παρεχόμενον*, not *φανυλοτάτην*. 502 the imperfect verse *έξω όργής πᾶς άνήρ σοφώτατος* would be better with *σοφώτερος*; and 148 read *χρή πρότερον* (not *πρώτον*) *αυτόν έμβλέψαντα* (after looking at yourself) *πράττειν <καί> εί κ.τ.λ.* 497 *οὐδέν τῶν έν τῷ βίῳ τάχιστα γηράσκει ὡς χάρις*: read *τάχιον*. *ὡς=ή*, as elsewhere, if not a mistake for it. 149 *ποῖος τῶν θανάτων κακός* stands for *κάκιστος*.

Present tenses put wrongly for futures: 97 and 503 *καταλείπω . . . τέκνα* (*Alexander is not dying*), 127 *οὐδέν άνδρείας χρήζομεν, έν πάντες ὤμεν δίκαιοι*, 265 *έγώ μοι δοκῶ . . . γράφειν προτρεπτικόν*, 360 *έγώ σε τρέφω μαχούμενον άλλ' οὐ λοιδορούμενον* (*λοιδορησόμενον*, unless we are to read *μαχόμενον*) *'Αλεξάνδρῳ*, 420 *παραμένοντας*, probably 481 *εί μὲν πονηρά πολιτεύηται (-εται ?), τοῖς θεοῖς ἀπάρεσκει* (*ἀπαρέσει ?*).

Small errors in case endings: 101 *τῶν θεῶν . . . τιμώτατος*, not *τιμώτατον*. 187 *τοσοῦτους . . . ἀπολώλεκεν ὅσους ἀρκεῖ* (read *ὅσους ἀρκει or ἤρκει*) *τοὺς βαρβάρους νικᾶν ἅπαντας*. 148 *αὐτός* should be *αὐτόν* (*καταδικάζων*). 346 *ἂν έκλογισθῇ τῶν δραμάτων έκαστον ὅσον κατέστη*: read *ὅσον*, what it cost.

401 Οἰνοπίδης εἶπε τὸν νοῦν παραίτιον δαίμονα· τοῖς μὲν πεπαιδευμένοις ἀγαθόν, τοῖς δὲ ἀπαιδευτοῖς κακὸν εἶναι: read παραίτιον δαίμονα τοῖς μὲν . . . ἀγαθόν, τοῖς δὲ κακὸν εἶναι. 460 read σύντροφον ἀρρωστίαν. 479 πείρας δευτέρας should be πείραν, *trial of a second wife*. 499 ἡδονὴν οὐ πᾶσαν ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ καλὸν αἰρεῖσθαι δεῖ: read ἐπὶ τῷ καλῷ, but *ibid.* ὅσῳ μὲν ἐπὶ τῇ φύσει πάντες ἔσμεν πλούσιοι, ὅσῳ δὲ κ.τ.λ. should on the other hand be ὅσον. 501 τῷ (τοῦ) λαμβάνειν <γάρ>? πάντες ἡττῶνται βροτοί. 503 ἐάν . . . ἀμορφίαν (-ία) νοσῇ. 505 διὰ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τούτου (τὸν ἄνδρα τούτου?) ἀπολλύμεθα. 506 ὅταν σαυτὸν ἀσθενέστερον θέλῃς γίγνεσθαι: read σαυτοῦ ἀσθενέστερος. 508 κατέγνω γὰρ τῶν πολλῶν ἀφιλίας (-ίαν). 511 φίλων (φίλον) φιλάργυρον ἰδὼν. Adjective stands for adverb in 124 πρῶος (πρῶως) καὶ μειδιῶν εἶπε 108. διδακτικὴν ἀπεδείκνυε τὴν ἀρετὴν: read διδακτὴν.

Mistakes in forms of verbs: 112 ὡς ὑπέρπολυ ἤτῃμαι: rather ἤτῃσαι you have asked. 194 φέρεσθαι δέ . . . δινουμένας καὶ οὕτω πάντα τὰ συγκρίνοντα γεννᾶν, πῦρ, ὕδωρ κ.τ.λ.: read συγκρινόμενα. 294 ἀπολοίμεθ' ἂν should be ἀπωλόμεθ' ἂν, as in Plutarch. 307 διττοὺς ἤτῃσε μισθοῦς· τοῦ δὲ τὴν αἰτίαν πωθόμενου, ἓνα μὲν, ἔφη, ἓνα λαλεῖν μάθης, τὸν ἕτερον <δὲ> ἵνα σιγῇς: read σιγᾶν. 454 ἔλεγεν οὖν ὁ Τιμόθεος, ὁ τηλικαύτας πόλεις λαμβάνων καθεύδων, τί με οἴσεται ποιήσιν ἐργηγορῶτα; read εἰ (for ὁ) and λαμβάνω.

Confusions of similar words: 108 ἀπεδείκνυε τοὺς αὐτοὺς εὐγενεῖς τοὺς καὶ ἐναρέτους; τοὺς should be οὓς. 110 ἄρπαξε τὸ καλῶς ἀποθνήσκειν, ὅτε ἔξεστι, μὴ κατὰ μικρὸν τὸ μὲν ἀποθνήσκειν σοι παρῇ, τὸ δὲ καλῶς μηκέτι ἐξῇ: read μετὰ μικρὸν, *soon*. 118 εἰπόντος (*having asked*) ἡ οὐ δοκεῖ αὐτῷ κ.τ.λ., ἡ is εἰ. So in 203 τί γάρ, εἶπεν, ἡ ἀγαθὸν ἡ κακὸν we should read τί γάρ, εἶπεν, εἰ; ἀγαθὸν ἡ κακόν; 267 δεῖν δὲ ἔλεγε τοὺς νέους πάσῃ κοσμιότητι χρῆσθαι καὶ πορεῖα καὶ σχήματι καὶ περιβολῇ: the first καὶ at least should be κἂν or καὶ ἐν. 265 ἔλεγε μὴ δεῖν ζητεῖν . . . οὔτινες ἐκ μεγάλης πόλεως εἰσιν, ἀλλ' εἰ μεγάλης πόλεως ἄξιοι: for οὔτινες read εἰ τινες, like εἰ following. On p. 505 εἰ actually appears in the same saying. 296 ἡ σύγκειται should be ἦ, and 299 read δέεται γὰρ οὐδενος (ὁ θεός) οὐδὲ παρὰ τῶν κρειττόνων ἥπερ (not ἥπερ) ἡμεῖς. 374 Ξενοκράτης ἐρόμενος τὸν (read τινὰ) παρ' αὐτῷ φιλοσοφεῖν νέον βουλόμενον κ.τ.λ. 438 τὸ ἐμὸν ἰμάτιον ἐμβιώναι μὲν (not ἐκβιώναι) ἐπιτιγδίων. 455 Χάρητα προσαγόντων καὶ τούτων (not τοιούτων) ἀξιούντων εἶναι τὸν Ἀθηναῖον στρατηγόν. 500 ἐπενδύεσθαι (ἵπ-?) δεῖ τῷ μὲν θώρακι χιτῶνα, τῇ δὲ λύπῃ νοῦν. 502 ἡ δὲ (not γὰρ) κακὴ βουλὴ κ.τ.λ. (*verse*). 503 μητρὸς ἐν δάκρυον πολλὰς διαβολὰς ἐπιστολὰς ἀπαλείφει only needs a change of accent to διαβόλων. 507 ὁ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν στρατηγός probably Ἀθηναῖον. 508 αὕτη (not αὐτή) τοῖς ἔργοις ἀναγκάζει.

Confusions of a more noticeable kind: 98 Alexander προσέτασσε τοῖς στρατιώταις ξυρεῖν τὰ τῶν Μακεδόνων γένηα. As the soldiers were themselves Macedonians, read στρατηγούς. 99 τὸν ποιητὴν οὕτω σεμνύναι τὰ ἔφα καὶ ποιῆσαι αὐτὰ τῷ Διὶ τὴν ἀμβροσίαν κομίζειν: ποιῆσαι should be ποιῆσαι. 122 τοῖς τὰ ἐνεργὴ πράγματα πειρωμένους δεικνύναι (*lighting a candle to show the sun*) should of course be ἐναργῇ. 176 δαπανώμενος ἐφ' ἃ μὴ δεῖ, ὀλίγος ἔσθ' ἐφ' ἃ δεῖ: ὀλίγος should be λιτός, as in 511 διὰ τί λιτός εἰ ἔχων χρήματα πολλὰ; and in

the lines of
ἐλκόμενοι συ
and the sam
φέρει. 193
ομοίᾳ φθορά
μᾶλλον ἢ κα
said that τ
suppose ὡ
words τὸ ἀ
common in
μόνος is evi
known conf
λέγοντος ὅτι
τοσοῦτους ἀ
τὸ τὴν οὐσί
corruption
γάρ. 426
ἀγνός δὲ ῥή
meter (εὐκρ
δοκῆσει φιλ
(ἐστί?), and
γασθαι, in v
ὅτε οὐδέπω
ἔστι, λυπηθ
Nauck pro
pointed eit
may have s
i.e. arose fr
being aske
ἀρχήν. 51
μένος. Th
nonsense.
the clay fr

Words
94 εἰπόντος
διατρίβοντο
This is pu
112 Hung
148 οὔτε γ
μὲν ἀρχομέ
γεγενημένα
καὶ <μείζ
διαρῶν <
ἀπένειμεν.

the lines of Moschion 363. 191 οἱ ἀπαίδευτοι καθάπερ οἱ ἀλιεύμενοι ἰχθύες ἐλκόμενοι σιγῶσιν shows the common confusion of ἀ- and εὐ- (οἱ εὐπαίδευτοι), and the same reversed occurs in 306 πῶς ἂν τις εὐτυχίαν (read ἄτυχίαν) ἀρίστα φέροι. 193 στάσις ἐμφύλιος εἰς ἑκάτερα καλόν· καὶ γὰρ νικέουσι καὶ ἡσσωμένους ὁμοίη φθορά: read κακόν: and again 497 ἀνοήτων τὸ αἰρεῖσθαι κακῶς ἄρχεισθαι μάλλον ἢ κακῶς ἄρχειν clearly from the context should be καλῶς ἄρχειν. 268 Zeno said that τὸ καθῆκον was ἐνέργημα ταῖς κατὰ φύσιν παρασκευαῖς ὠκείαις: I suppose ὠκείαις stands for οἰκείον. 295 an argument is introduced by the words τὸ ἀκόλουθον οὕτως ἑώρα, where ἑώρα represents a word for arguing common in post-classical Greek, ἥρωτα. It occurs again 296 and 298. 298 σὺ μόνος is evidently οὐ μόνον, and 329 καὶ σὺ γε probably μὴ σύγε. The well-known confusion of λέγω and ἔχω appears in 369 Νικοκλῆς κακοῦ τιнос ἱατροῦ λέγοντος ὅτι μεγάλην ἔχει δύναμιν ἔφη· πῶς γὰρ οὐ μέλλεις λέγειν (ἔχειν), ὅς τοσοῦτους ἀνηρηκῶς ἀνεύθυνος γέγονας; and in 422 εἶπε πενίαν ἡγήτεον εἶναι μὴ τὸ τὴν οὐσίαν ἐλάττω ποιεῖν ἀλλὰ τὸ τὴν ἀπληστίαν πλείω probably ποιεῖν is a corruption of εἶναι, ποι being τω repeated. 346 οὕτω γὰρ should be αὐτὸς γάρ. 426 ρεῖται γὰρ καὶ παρέχεται (παρέρχεται) ὥς χόρτος πᾶσα φύσις. *idid.* ἀγνὸς δὲ ῥήτωρ εὐκράτος ἁρμονία, though it may be right, looks like a pentameter (εὐκροτος ἁρμονία). In 498 are two rather puzzling sentences: ἵπ' οὐδενὸς δοκῇσει φιλεῖσθαι τις μὴδένα φιλῶν, where for δοκῇσει the sense suggests δικάσιος (έσις?), and ἱατρὸν καὶ φίλον οὐ τὸν ἰδιώτην ἀλλὰ τὸν ὠφελιμώτερον δεῖ ἐκλέγεσθαι, in which it seems probable that ἰδιώτην is a perversion of ἡδίων. 500 εἰ, ὅτε οὐδέπω ἦν, οὐκ ἐλνποῦ, μὴδὲ νοῦ (only a misprint for νῦν?), ὅτε οὐκ (οὐκέτι?) ἔστι, λυπηθῆς. 507 Μένανδρος τὸν φθόνον πρόνοιαν τῆς ψυχῆς εἶπεν (Kock 935) Nauck proposed the insipid *πονηρίαν*, Kock *παράνοιαν*, which is not very pointed either. *ψυχὴ* and *τύχη* being constantly confused, I think Menander may have said that envy was ἀπόνοια (or -γνοια) τῆς τύχης, *despair of good luck*, i.e. arose from a man's despair of equalling what he envied. 506 Theocritus, being asked τί θείον, answered τὸ μῆτε ὀργὴν μῆτε τελευτήν ἔχον: ὀργὴν must be ἀρχήν. 511 Φίλιππος τὸν πλούσιον καὶ ἀπαίδευτον ἔφησε πλούτος περιηργυρωμένος. The last two words should of course be accusatives, but πλούτος π. is nonsense. Should we not read πηλὸν περιηργυρωμένον, understanding πηλὸς of the clay from which Prometheus made man?

Words omitted, sometimes from recurrence or partial recurrence of letters.

94 εἰπόντος <ὡς>. 109 ἐκ πάντων <τῶν> Σωκρατικῶν. 111 περὶ πολιτικὰ διατρίβοντι 'εἶθε' ἔφη ἡ γυνὴ 'τὰ μὲν ἴδια κοινὰ ἐνόμισας, τὰ δὲ κοινὰ ἴδια.' This is puzzling until we see that *μή* has been lost, probably after *νη* in *γυνή*. 112 Hunger and thirst are able *μεγάλως* <ἐνοχλεῖν> τοῖς σωφροσύνην διώκουσι. 148 οὔτε γὰρ ζωγράφον <τὸν>? εὐχόμενον εἶναι. 196 ὁ αὐτὸς ἔλεγε *πονηρίαν* μὲν ἀρχομένην κωλύσαι τάχ' ἂν τις κολάζων δυνηθείη, ἐγκαταγεγρακκυῖαν δὲ καὶ γεγεννημένον (or -ην) τῶν εἰθισμένων τιμωριῶν ἀδύνατον εἶναι [ἔλεγεν]. Read καὶ <μείζω> γεγεννημένην. 294 μήτ' ἐκείνον <ἂν> γενέσθαι κ.τ.λ. 375 ὁ αὐτὸς διαιρῶν <μέρος> ἔκαστον τῆς ἡμέρας εἰς πρᾶξιν τινα καὶ τῇ σιωπῇ μέρος ἀπένειμεν. 420 τούτους ἔφη <δεῖν> καθιστάναι ἀρχοντας καὶ <γυναῖκα>

καὶ ἄνδρα (probably only a printer's omission). 422 ἔφη πῖνόντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἴλεω <μᾶλλον> τότε ἢ πρότερον γενέσθαι (γίγνεσθαι?), and so too 508 τοῖς παισὶ συνεβούλευεν αἰδῶ καταλιπεῖν <μᾶλλον> ἢ χρυσόν, where παισὶ depends on καταλιπεῖν. 436 πρὸς τὸν εἰπόντα 'ἀποθανοῦμαι εἰ μὴ σε τιμωρησαίμην' ἔφη 'ἀποθανοῦμαι εἰ μὴ σε φίλον ποιήσω': the version of this on 500 shows conclusively that to each ἀμυνοῦμαι we must prefix οὐκ. 438 θανμάζειν ἔλεγε τῶν τὰς λιθίνους εἰκόνας κατασκευαζομένων <τὸ> τοῦ μὲν λίθου προνοεῖν κ.τ.λ. 496 ἐν μὲν τῷ πολέμῳ πρὸς ἀσφάλειαν χρυσὸς <λογισμοῦ> κρείττων, ἐν δὲ τῷ ἔξῃ λογισμὸς πλοῦτον. 499 πάντα ἄλλα should be πάντα τᾶλλα. 504 ὁ <νεανίσκε>, σποῦδασον, and above ὁ αὐτὸς ἐρωτηθεὶς τί ἂν (?) εἴη ἀριστον ἐν τῷ βίῳ εἶπε συνειδήσεις <ἀρετῆς or ἀγαθῆς> 505 οὐδὲ (οὔτε?) τὰ <τοῦ> Μῆδου οὔτε τὰ Κροίσου χρήματα. 511 ἰδὼν νεανίαν <παιδεῖαν or γράμματα> φιλοῦντα ἔφη 'κάλλιστον ὄψον τῷ γήρατι ἀρτύεις.'

118 ἔχων τοὺς τῶν φευγόντων Περσῶν represents τοὺς φεύγοντας τῶν Περσῶν or possibly τ. τ. Π. φ. 124 εἶπεν ὅτι πλῆθ' ἔοικε τῷ παρὰ γῆν ὁ τῶν πενήτων βίος, ὁ δὲ τῶν πλουσιῶν τῷ διὰ πελάγους· τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ῥᾶδιόν ἐστι καὶ πείσμα βαλεῖν καὶ προσχεῖν (read προσσχεῖν) καὶ νεωλεκῆσαι, τοῖς δ' οὐ. πενήτων and πλουσιῶν have clearly exchanged places. 95 ὁ μὲν γὰρ (his father Philip) τοῦ γενέσθαι, ὁ δὲ (his teacher Aristotle) τοῦ καλῶς γενέσθαι αἷτιος. The second γενέσθαι is certainly a mere blunder, due to the first, for ζῆν. Cf. 511 οἱ μὲν γονεῖς τοῦ ζῆν μόνον, οἱ δὲ διδάσκαλοι τοῦ καλῶς ζῆν αἷτιοι γεγόνασιν and the same in Plut. *Alex.* 8. 297 ἀρά γε, Θεόδωρε, θεὸς εἶναι φῆς, τοῦτο καὶ εἰ; ἐπινεύσαντος δε, φῆς δ' εἶναι θεός; . . . θεός εἰ ἄρα, ἔφη. The same story is in Diog. L., and there the second θεός has been duly corrected in modern times to θεόν. I quote the passage here, because the first θεός is a mere anticipation in writing of the second and third. The real word was δ or ὅτι (εἶναι φῆς), as the text of Diogenes shows. 466 οὐ μετ' οὐ πολὺ is a jumble of μετ' οὐ πολὺ (just below) and οὐ μετὰ πολὺ. 500 σοφὸς οὐδεὶς πλὴν ὃν ἂν τιμᾷ θεόν. Transposition will turn 497 οὐδεὶς ἐλευθέρου ὁ ἑαυτοῦ μὴ κρατῶν into another iambic, οὐδεὶς ἑαυτοῦ μὴ κρατῶν ἐλευθέρου, and 502 read οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν κρείσσον οἰκίον φίλου for φίλου οἰκίον. Transposition is also needed 506 ὁ αὐτὸς ἐρωτηθεὶς τί ἐστὶ φίλος 'ἄλλος οἷος ἐγώ,' which should of course be οἷος ἄλλος ἐγώ.

I add one or two miscellaneous difficulties: 111 (Aristides) ἐμοὶ μὲν ἡ πενία οὐδὲν ἱστορήσει κακόν, σοὶ δὲ ὁ πλοῦτος ταραχὰς οὐκ ὀλίγας. Should ἱστορήσει be συνιστορεῖ? 211 Diogenes said ὅτι, ἂν μὲν κύνης αὐτὸν σπαράξουσιν, Ἴρκανία ἔσται ἡ ταφή· ἂν δὲ γῆπες, ἀπτόεν· ἂν δὲ μηδεὶς προσέλθῃ, ὁ χρόνος καλλίων τῇ ταφῇ διὰ τῶν πολυτελεσμάτων, ἡλίου καὶ ὕμβρου. There are several puzzles in this: all I have to suggest is that τῶν πολυτελεσμάτων is τῶν πολὺ εὐτελεσμάτων. 296 Theodorus the Cyrenaic held κλέψκει τε καὶ μοιχεύσειν καὶ ἱεροσυλήσειν (τοὺς σπουδαίους), μηδὲν τούτων φύσει αἰσχρὸν εἶναι τῆς ἐπ' αὐτῆς δόξης αἰρουμένους: this seems to conceal something like μηδὲν τούτων φύσει αἰσχρὸν εἶναι <ἀνευ? χωρὶς?> τῆς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς δόξης ἡγουμένους. 371 Neo-

πτόλεμον τὸν
λεχθέντων ἢ Σ
pointless and
'what is mos
themselves to
quotable, tha
it that the g
there are too
we are to do

Owing to
correcting wh
better form no

πτόλεμον τὸν τῆς τραγωδίας ὑποκριτὴν ἤρετό τις τί θαυμάζοι τῶν ὑπ' Αἰσχύλου
λεχθέντων ἢ Σοφοκλέους ἢ Εὐριπίδου· οὐδὲν μὲν τούτων, εἶπεν. This is of course
pointless and incomplete or wrong. In these Greek anecdotes a question like
'what is most so and so?' occurs so constantly, as though people devoted
themselves to giving an eminent man the opportunity of saying something
quotable, that we ought probably to read τί θαυμάζοι <μάλιστα>, and to take
it that the great actor answered in effect: 'I don't admire anything most:
there are too many fine things in them all for that.' But I do not know what
we are to do with οὐδὲν μὲν τούτων.

Owing to the nature of the compilation, I fear I may in places have been
correcting what appears elsewhere and has been corrected already or in a
better form needs no correction.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

WESSELY'S PALAEOGRAPHICAL STUDIES.¹

Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde, VIII. Griechische Papyrusurkunden kleineren Formats [Theil II.]. Von Dr. C. Wessely. Leipzig: Eduard Avenarius. 4to. 1908. Pp. 137-307 (numbered consecutively with Part I.). M. 8.

THE usefulness of the valuable collection of Byzantine documents published by Wessely in 1904 under the above title has been seriously impaired by the want of an index, reserved for the second part; and all students of Byzantine papyri will welcome the appearance of this part. The volume contains exceedingly full indices (rather inconveniently arranged) of words, persons, places, symbols and abbreviations, and grammatical peculiarities; and there is in addition a numerical table of all the documents published in the collection. The series of texts is continued by 645 fresh documents. A good many of these are republished from other collections, but a considerable number are new, and those republished include many of the Paris papyri originally edited by Wessely in the *Wiener Denkschriften*, which are here given in much improved texts.

The whole collection is a storehouse of material for the organization of Egypt in Byzantine and early Arab times. Some of the smaller fragments, it is true, seem too unimportant to be worth publishing; but even mere scraps occasionally furnish interesting words or phrases. The volume, like the previous one, is lithographed, a method which permits abbreviations, symbols, and the many examples of shorthand which occur in these documents to be given in a form more faithful to the MSS. Thus it possesses a great educative value. The autotype method also makes it possible to give illegible words or phrases in facsimile. In cases where the papyrus is not much damaged this is sometimes very useful; but when the traces are only slight it may be doubted whether the pains taken justify themselves. It is almost impossible, for example, to make anything of such reproductions as 825, l. 3 or 828, l. 5, and in many cases it seems doubtful whether the facsimiles really give a correct representation of the appearance of the original. Thus in 1345, l. 5 a comparison of Wessely's facsimile with the photograph in Moritz's *Arabic*

¹ It should perhaps be mentioned that this notice was written before the appearance of Wilcken's review in *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, V. 290 ff.

Palaeography v
given by the p

The volu
which Wesse
and suggested
collection :

702, l. 2.
is a payment
poll-tax (for t
British Muse
that the pay
Women sever
always in su
payments we
tax-payment
of receipts a
Neor(). It
name.

718, l. 2.
723, l. 1.
The same w
occurs in the
733, l. 3.
text seems to

769, l. 3.
analogies in
i.e. 'at 1 soli
837, l. 2.
a stroke thro
878, l. 1.
dito Papyri,

898, l. 2.
901, l. 1.
papyri, is κ
Zeitsch. f. A
913, l. 2.
σπάθ(ου) ?
915, l. 1.

of the Aph
(i.e. 'page o
read in 915
mate date f
the seventh
Xoveis Σαp

Palaeography will show how entirely the former misrepresents the impression given by the papyrus itself.

The volume is full of interesting points, and there are not a few difficulties which Wessely has been compelled to leave unsolved. The following notes and suggested emendations are the result of a somewhat hasty reading of the collection:

702, l. 2. W(essely) Κουτίλλα Γ' () νεοτ' (). It is to be noticed that this is a payment for *διαγραφή*. It is, I think, almost certain that *διαγραφή* is poll-tax (for the proof of this I must refer to the forthcoming vol. iv. of the British Museum *Catalogue of Greek Papyri*), and it is therefore noteworthy that the payment is made by a woman, since women did not pay poll-tax. Women several times (656, 697, 700, 742) occur as paying *διαγραφή*, but are always in such cases described as wife (*γαμετή*) of someone; presumably the payments were made on behalf of their husbands (cf. especially 656, where the tax-payment is from the wife of Lōlipisōei, a man who appears in a number of receipts as paying *διαγραφή*). I therefore conjecture Κούτίλλα γα(μετή) Νεοτ' (). It must be confessed however that Νεοτ' () is a curious personal name.

718, l. 2. l. δτ/(= διὰ τῶν) ? and (ὑπὲρ) λόγου χρεία(s).

723, l. 1. ωρβοπολεω: ὀρβοποῶλου, as apparently W. takes it (see index). The same word, as ὀρβοπολ or ὀρβιονπολ (from the diminutive of ὄρβος), occurs in the Aphrodito Papyri.

733, l. 3. W. gives in the index ὀρβοκαπηλείας, but the facsimile in the text seems to read ὀρδεοκπλ. Perhaps ὀρδεο- = the Lat. *hordeum*?

769, l. 3. (ὑπὲρ) σί(του) (ἀρταβῶν) νθ δ' τοῦ ι. This phrase finds many analogies in the Aphrodito Papyri. τοῦ ι stands for τοῦ νομίσματος ἀρτάβαι ι, i.e. 'at 1 solidus per 10 artabae.'

837, l. 2. W. explains the symbol as μέτρα. It is probably ξέσται (a ξ with a stroke through it); so in the Aphrodito Papyri, and cf. this collection, 912, 2.

878, l. 1. Perhaps πακτ <ω> νοπρατῶν, a word which occurs in the Aphrodito Papyri, referring to the guild of sellers of πακτῶνες.

898, l. 2. W. κ(α)τ(ὰ) απαξ/(?) Perhaps rather κ(α)τ(ὰ) (δευτέραν) τάξ(ιν).

901, l. 1. καλαφτ/: this word, which occurs also in several of the following papyri, is *καλαφάταις*, *caulkers*; cf. Becker, *Arab. Papyri des Aphroditofundes* in *Zeitsch. f. Assyriol.* xx. p. 87.

913, l. 2. W. μ[σθ(οῦ)]. This seems impossible from the facsimile. Qu. στάβλ(ου) ?

915, l. 1. l. π[α]λλι[καρίφ]. The word means a page, attendant. In one of the Aphrodito Papyri occurs a Σισίνιο[ς παλλικ(άριον)] τοῦ συμβούλου (i.e. 'page of the Governor'). Probably this is the same person, and we may read in 915, ll. 1, 2 π[α]λλι[καρίφ τοῦ] | [συμβουλο]ῦ. This gives an approximate date for all this series of documents addressed to Cyricus, i.e. the end of the seventh or beginning of the eighth century. The occurrence in 945 of Χονεῖς Σαρακηνός indicates that they are of the Arab period.

922, ll. 1-2. W. *δερμ F βαχθεντ*. *l*. probably *δερμ(ά)τ(ων) F β/(=6 $\frac{1}{2}$) ἀχθέντ(ων)*.

952, l. 2. The abbreviation after *σταβλίτ(η)* is probably λ = *λόγω*. The use of *ἀλλαγή* as 'posting-station' finds parallels in the Aphroditō Papyri.

978, l. 2. *l*. probably *ὄν(όμασιν) δέκα*. This page and the preceding one are given in wrong order.

992, l. 2. W. *Σακελλάριος*. It seems more likely that this is a common noun = *σακελλάριος*. *σάκελλα* is regularly used in the Aphroditō Papyri for the central treasury at Babylon—Fustāt. *σακελλάριος* will be an official of the treasury. After *ὑμῖν l. τοῖς*. The document is an order for payment of taxes.

993, l. 2. *Σύμμαχος*: perhaps this too should be taken as a common noun in the usual sense (at this time) of 'letter-carrier.'

1051, l. 3. *παράσχ(ου) τοῖς κουρσ()*: I suggest *κουρσαρίοις*, 'corsairs.' *κοῦρσον*, Lat. *cursus*, in the sense of the annual raids of the Arabs against the Empire, is regularly used in the Aphroditō Papyri, and in one place *προκουρσαρίοι* occurs, in the sense, apparently, of 'corsairs.'

1082, l. 3, end. *l*. λ = *λόγω*.

1083, l. 4. *l*. probably *λόγω* (not *λόγος* as W.) *τ(ων) ὀρρ(ίων) [Ba]βυ(λῶνος) ἀρτ(άβαι) κ.τ.λ.*

1084, l. 1. It seems natural to suppose that *τοῖς* has been omitted before *ἀπὸ λαύρας*, though *ἡμῶν* (l. 3), if not for *ὑμῶν*, suggests that this is a declaration by the tax-payer. In that case *[παρ]άσχ(ε)ς* is perhaps wrong. In 1180 also *ἀπὸ λαύρας* occurs not preceded by *τοῖς*. l. 2. *l*. (*ὑπὲρ*) (*τετάρτου*) *ἐξαγί(ου) δημ(οσίων)*. *ἐξάγιον*, occurs frequently in the Aphroditō Collection and in Coptic papyri as 'collection.' [On this word compare Dr. Postgate in *Am. J. Phil.* VI. 462 ff.]

1085, l. 3. Qu. *l*. *γρ(αφέντος) M[. . . , ἐνεχθ(έντος)] δ/(=διὰ) [Aβ]δερ(αμαν)?*

1086, l. 2. Qu. *l*. *κα]τοβα*, sc. *κατ<a>βολῆς*? This mis-spelling occurs once or twice in the Aphroditō Papyri.

1180. This is an interesting document, as it evidently concerns fugitives who had fled from their own district and had been allowed to settle at Heraclēopolis; cf. *Journ. of Hell. Stud.* xxviii. p. 107 ff.; Becker, *Zeitsch. f. Assy.* xxii. p. 139 ff. The extension of the abbreviations, if the readings are right, would appear to be *ἐλαχέν σοι (ὑπὲρ) μέ(ρους) διαγρ(αφῆς) τῶ(ν) ἐαθέ(ντων) ξέ(νων) εἰ(ς) τ(ήν) πόλ(ιν) ὠρισθ(έντος) αὐτ(οῖς) διαγρ(άφειν) ἀντ(ί) κ(α)τ(α)β(ο)λ(ῆς) (ὑπὲρ) τ(ὼν) αὐτ(ὼν) ξέ(νων) (ὑπὲρ) δημ(οσίων) τ(ῇ) πόλ(εως)*. The sense seems to be that the tax-payer addressed is to pay part of the *διαγραφή* (poll-tax) for the new-comers, 'they having been ordered to pay poll-tax (perhaps *ὠρισθείσης αὐτοῖς διαγραφῆς*) instead of the payment for the said strangers for the *δημόσια* of the city'; but the bearing of this last clause is obscure to me, unless *δημόσια* is used, as sometimes, for 'land-tax.' The mention of *ξένοι* makes it likely that the document may belong to the Arab period.

1286, par
Muhājirūn, i.
This proves
ment must be

1345, l.
A reading of
been already
note), viz. Φ.

1286, part 2, l. 2. l. (ὑπὲρ) τ(ῶν) Μωαγαρ(ι)τ(ῶν). The word is the Arabic *Muhājirūn*, i.e. Arab settlers in Egypt; cf. *Journ. of Hell. Stud.* xxviii. p. 113. This proves that W.'s date (sixth to seventh century) is too early. The document must be as late as 640 at the earliest.

1345, l. 5. The facsimile here, as already remarked, is very misleading. A reading of the line from the photograph in Moritz's *Arabic Palaeography* has been already suggested by the present writer (*Journ. of Hell. Stud.* xxviii. p. 98, note), viz. Φαῶφ(ι) . ἰνδ(ικτιόν)ο(ς) ε.

H. I. BELL.

MR. T. W. ALLEN ON AGAR'S *HOMERICA*.

I FEEL reluctantly compelled to set right one or two points of moment in which Mr. Allen, in his very interesting and able criticism of *Homerica* in the July number of the *Classical Quarterly*, has fallen into error. I have no wish to refute or dispute any opinions he has chosen to express—that would, perhaps, be a little severe on a reviewer who cannot, under the circumstances, do more than communicate his first impressions—but I certainly think I may fairly ask to be permitted to correct absolute misrepresentations, however innocently made, of my own statements. They are eight in number. I rigidly confine myself to them, and simply follow the order in which they occur in the *Classical Quarterly*.

(i.) On ϵ 209 I am credited with saying without qualification that ὕδατος ἀνὰ εἴκοσι μέτρα has 'no suitable sense at all.' Now, I am bound to say this is not my statement by any means. Mr. Allen has, I am afraid, misunderstood no less than a whole paragraph of *Homerica*. I said, 'this view'—the view that δέπας is the object after χεῖρε—'leaves ἀνὰ εἴκοσι μέτρα without any suitable sense at all.' There is, I submit, a very important difference—a vital difference—between what I really said and what has been attributed to me by Mr. Allen.

(ii.) On η 130 Mr. Allen remarks that I have an odd idea of Alcinous's water-supply. 'A piece of ornamental water must have decorated the yard.' In these words I am supposed to express the view I take, and the comment upon them is: 'What a sight!' Well, will it be believed that I explicitly denied the ornamental water explanation, and argued that it was inadmissible? Curiously enough, Mr. Allen himself is willing to posit an artificial tank, so that apparently what he objects to is the ornamentation. I might consistently object to both.

(iii.) ι 30. Mr. Allen writes: 'This verse is absent in most MSS. Mr. Agar condemns it, but, unable to do without it, composes another in its place.' I am more than surprised to hear this. What can Mr. Allen mean? The statement is quite inexcusable and unaccountable, unless he is crediting me with the authorship of

οὔτε σὺν πανωλέθροισιν οὔτ' ἄνευ πανωλέθρων.

I may as well confess I borrowed this from Aristophanes, and never contemplated the possibility of its being hastily taken for a hexameter of my own composition.

(iv.) λ 6
for the usual
is taken prim
entirely new
a 'column of
and acquiesc

(v.) σ 1
I have said
a verb, *περά*
this sense, is
that *θέλω*
stimulate.'

(vi.) Mr.
fundamenta
from this th
smirking hy
is a feature
there is no

(vii.) ζ
me that we
he has fail
certainly se
Satz *μάλα*

(viii.), α
or, as he h
reasonable
unguentum
because *κα*
that of th
anyone ma
'modern'

error. Hi
than mine
that his l
following
ἀμβροσίω
ointment.
manus me

January,

(iv.) λ 600. Here again, as in (ii.), while declining any direct responsibility for the usual interpretation of this passage, I must point out that my objection is taken primarily against *κονίη*, and not against *ἐκ κρατός*; Mr. Allen offers an entirely new explanation of his own, never before heard of, that *κονίη* means a 'column of steam,' and the impression is left that I ought to have known and acquiesced in this very odd and rather improbable idea.

(v.) σ 158. In dealing with this passage, Mr. Allen entirely ignores what I have said on the question, possibly from a desire to be brief. To state that a verb, *πετάσειε*, means to 'excite,' 'stimulate,' and then that *θέλξειε* gives this sense, is merely to make confusion worse confounded. Every tiro knows that *θέλω* means 'to put an end to excitement,' 'to soothe,' and not 'to stimulate.'

(vi.) Mr. Allen says my remark on δ 93, 'smirking hypocrisy,' betrays a fundamental misapprehension of heroic character. One would hardly suppose from this that I had questioned the genuineness of δ 93 on the ground of its smirking hypocrisy. Surely Mr. Allen does not think that smirking hypocrisy is a feature of heroic character? I emphatically do not, and should fancy there is no difference of opinion between us.

(vii.) ζ 273. Here again, on the subject of Greek punctuation, it seems to me that we are in substantial agreement, and Mr. Allen assails me only because he has failed to grasp with accuracy the substance of my statements. He certainly seems to have quite overlooked the words quoted from Nitzsch: 'Der Satz *μάλα* bis *δῆμον* bildet keine Parenthese.'

(viii.), and last. I am rather severely taken to task, admonished, and lectured, or, as he himself puts it, he is 'dumb' at some length, because of a quite reasonable comment of mine on Fick's remark on *κάλλει* (σ 192), 'mirum unguentum.' I said, not an unguent, but rather a sort of modern toilet-soap, because *καθαίρειν* describes a process of washing and cleansing rather than that of the subsequent anointing. At the moment I was pointing out, as anyone may see, the difficulties of the passage, not solving them. The word 'modern' itself should have sufficed, one would think, to save Mr. Allen from this error. His lash in this case also, as in (ii.) and (iv.), falls upon other shoulders than mine. He will learn, I am sure, not without a touch of pious horror, that his lamented coadjutor, the late Provost of Oriel himself, wrote the following note upon this very passage in his edition of *Od.* xiii.-xxiv.: '*κάλλει ἀμβροσίῳ* appears to be used in a concrete sense for some kind of paint or ointment.' Did Dr. Monro also, as well as myself, misunderstand '*lauabo manus meas in innocentia*'? I think not.

T. L. AGAR.

January, 1910.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

GENERAL.

Mnemosyne. 37. 2. 1909.

A. Poutsma, *De emphasi disputatio*. The MSS. are our best, though not an infallible guide in deciding whether an enclitic pronoun can stand in what we regard as an emphatic sense. Passages like Soph. *O.R.* 140, 405; Eur. *Tro.* 945, etc., etc., show how different Greek feeling was from ours in this matter. N. J. Krom, *De Hellenotamiis in libro de rep. Athen. commemoratis*. In Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 12. 24 explains τοὺς δ' ἑλληνοταμίαις οἱ ἂν διαχειρίζωνται τὰ χρήματα μὴ συμβουλευεῖν by supposing that when a sum of money had to be paid the duty of paying it was assigned to particular members of the Board, and that these members, so long as they were engaged in this task, did not attend the Senate. J. J. H., *Ad Plutarchum*. In ps. Plut. *de Lib. educ.* 8 read παραίνεσι καὶ φόβοις (for λόγους), 13 α ἀντὶ δὲ συμβουλευμάτων for τῶν δὲ συμβ. J. van Leeuwen, *Ad fragmentum comicum nuper editum*. Oxyrh. Pap. vi. p. 150. In l. 16 sqq. read εἰδὲ τις τὴν τῶν φρενῶν | στακτὴν; ἐκνίσθη; 'Excidit Dauo perterritio metus indicium apertissimum, ut . . . Dionysio apud inferos iter facienti.' v. L., Σκολιῷ—Δυσκολία. In Aristoph. cod. V (excerpta de comoedia) read ἐπὶ τοῖς οὖν οἷς ἐπισταμένοις μέλι πρὸς λύραν ᾄδεν <δυσ>κολία <εἶναι> ἰδοῦκε, ὅθεν καὶ σκολία ὠνομάσθησαν. Ch. Charitonides, *De Figura quae κατ' ἐξοχὴν vocatur*. Copious exx. of (1) ὁ ποιητής = Homer; (2) ὁ κωμικός = Aristoph.; (3) ὁ συγγραφεὺς = Thuc.; (4) ὁ φιλόσοφος = Plato; (5) ὁ ῥήτωρ = Demosthenes; (6) ὁ τραγικός = Sophocles; (7) ὁ λυρικός καὶ ὁ μελοποιός = Pindar; (8) ὁ γεωγράφος = Strabo; (9) ὁ τεχνικός = Herodian; (10) ὁ θεολόγος = Gregory of Nazianzus; (11) ἡ θεός and (12) Παρθένος = Athene; (13) ὁ νεώς = the Parthenon; (14) ἡ κόρη = Persephone; (15) βασιλεὺς; (16) Πόντος, Χερσόνησος; (17) Πύλαι = Thermopylae; (18) νῆσος = Ortygia; (19) ὄψων = ichthys; (20) ὄρνις = cock; (21) πρόβατον = οἶς. J. J. H., *Ad Plutarchum*. *Quom. Adol.* 24 ε ἀνθρώπου for αὐτοῦ, 33 c ἐπὶ τῷ for ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ. H. van Herwerden, *Nouae criticae Moralium Plutarchi*. Emendations. H. v. H. *Emendatur Cicero pro Caes. § 27*. Read <uix> = ignoscebam. J. v. Leeuwen, *Homericæ*. Takes ἀβρομοὶ ἀΐψαχοι in N 41 as = *taciti*, which suits the comparison with θέλλα: it is the calm before the storm. J. J. H., *Ad Plutarchi libellum quomodo adulator*, etc. Emendations. J. van Leeuwen, *Ad Menandri fragmenta noua*. Arrangement of the dialogue in Körte's two new fragments of the Perikeiromene. J. J. H., *Ad Plutarchum*. In *Quom. Adul.* 34 ε read καὶ νῆ Δία 'τῷ λέγειν ἐφέξῃς ἀριστε.'

37. 3. 1909.

C. Charitonides, *De figura quae κατ' ἐξοχὴν vocatur* (ctd. from part 2) Θήρ = lion, πῆρος = blind, ἔπος = (dactylic) verse, ὥρα ἔτους = summer, μαθήματα = arithmetic and geometry, etc. J. J. H., *Ad Plutarchum*. In *Quom. adul.*, etc., 71D read ὤφειλεν for ὀφείλομεν. J. C. Naber, *Observatt. de iure Romano*. C. Quid proprie in iudicium deducatur. J. J. H., *Ad Plutarchum*. In *Quom. adul.*, etc., 63D read καταλυσάμενος for διαλυσάμενος, 68B transpose so as to read αἰτίαν λυδορίας ὥσπερ σόφισμα φιλίας. H. van Herwerden, *Ad Dionem Prusaensem*. Conji. on *Orr.* 1, 3-7, 11-13, 16, 21, 26,

29, 31-38, 40, 41. In *Præc. reip.* ἰπολειμμάτων, alius ostendit D. M. is the Ital. 1. 71 la to be defend 574 atque (for (litura), 678 operandi uolu 634 timet (ten (with inuadit (atra) and oth tions on Bks. ἀπαρρησίαστο

37. 4. I. M. J. Aristogiton : of the orches tomb (tombs the day of the heroes were heroes Quando ex two words suggest an Phaedrum. βοράνην σοφ προανακρίνω Panegyricos (coniuncta); 12, effecisti

Neue

F. No of the drape which the Die antiken Vetus, Aqu plinger, Le time; L's cowardice, poetry and E. V. Har Einzug bei 399.). Zola

[24.

23.

Th. I be found

29, 31-38, 40, 41, 43, 48, 49, 52, 56, 63, 64, 66, 68, 73, 74. J. J. H., *Ad Plutarchum*. In *Præc. reip. ger.* 816E τὸν φθόνον is not wanted; in *Rect. rat. aud.* 38E read, for ὑπολειμμάτων, λεγμάτων. J. Vürtheim, *Catulli Carm.* 25. 5. Read cum *Dina Mulier* alites ostendit oscitantes: crows were a sign of storm and rain (Lucr. 5, 1083 sqq.). D. M. is the *Dina Cornisca* of C. I. L. 1. 814. P. H. Damsté, *Notulae criticae ad Sil. Ital.* 1. 71 laudum (for tandem) with ortus, 113 his arsit stimulis, 126 fragrantis sanguine to be defended by *Aen.* 12. 35, 148 put stop after feritas, 209-210 to follow 197, 574 atque (for ast: but 2. 134 ast for atque); 2. 259 obstantis (for optantis), 460 lintea (litorea), 678 telum (letum); 3. 161 vis dura laboris (for labori)=strenua ac perucax operandi uoluntas, 230 traductum (tam dirum), 283 manus (domus), 515 terras (turmas), 634 timet (tenet); 4. 5 capit or rapit (canit), 188 Clanio dubia meditatur cuspidē uulnus (with inuadit CLANIUM in 252), 340 havenis (habenē), 502 in arma (in armis), 620 arta (atra) and other emendations. H. van Herwerden, *Ad Zosimi Hist. nouam*. Emendations on Bks. 1-5. J. J. H., *Ad Plutarchum*. In *Quom. adul.*, etc. 68D read τῷ for καί, ἀπαρηρσιάζον εἶναι for ἀπαρηρσιάζου, in 72B ἄλλως for ἀπλῶς.

37. 4. 1909.

I. M. J. Valetón, *Quaest. Graecae*. (Contd. from part 1) 4. Harmodius and Aristogiton: (a) their statues (return of them to Athens, statues now extant, the site of the orchestra, date of the decree), with excursus on the Pisistratid stele; (b) their tomb (tombs of those who fell in war, public festivals of the dead), with excursus on the day of the public funeral of those who fell in war. The blood sacrifice offered the heroes was instituted in quite early times, and did not then imply that they were heroes, not ordinary mortals. T. C. Naber, *Observat. de iure Romano*. c1. Quando ex usu recesserit rei in iudicium deductae clausula. J. V., *Oscen-oscitare*. The two words connected—'oscen coruus est quia oscitando mala portendit'—they suggest an old word *†oscio*=*os late diducere*. I. C. Vollgraff, *Coniectanea in Platonis Phaedrum*. Pp. 227D-277A. J. J. H., *Ad Plutarchum*. In *Rect. rat. aud.* 42A κηφῶνων βοράνην σοφιστικῶν comes from a comic writer, in 43E read, for καί, ὡς καί, and for προσανακρίνοιντας, προσανακρινούντας (προσιόντας is future). J. van Wageningen, *Ad Panegyricos Latinos*. 2. 1 hospitem consecrasse (for *†hospitē condidisse*), ib. 6 cuncta (coniuncta); 4. 5 litteratorum (litterarum); 7. 11 tuto (toto), ib. sine fine <poena > documento, 12, effecisti (fecisti); 11. 20 erroneo (ternos); 12. 33 militibusque (motibusque).

Neue Jahrbücher für das klass. Altertum. 23. 4. 1909.

F. Noack, *Das Gewandproblem in der griech. Kunstentwicklung*. The development of the draped figure due to the desire to find an equivalent for the great advantages which the right to represent the male figure absolutely nude involved. T. Ashley, *Die antiken Wasserleitungen der Stadt Rom*. Mainly concerning the course of the Anio Vetus, Aqua Marcia, Aqua Claudia, and Anio Novus (with several plates). E. Stemplinger, *Lessings 'Rettungen des Horaz.'* Views held as to Horace's character in L's time; L's taste for the Latin poet; his defence of him against charges of immorality, cowardice, and lack of religion. The work involves an analysis of the laws of lyric poetry and the justification of the despised calling of the poets. M. Schneidewin, *E. V. Hartmanns Naturphilosophie. Anzeigen und Mitteilungen*: J. Moeller, *Agamemnon's Einzug bei Aeschylus in der neueren Literatur*. Influence upon Goethe (*Faust*, ii. 9342 sqq.), Zola (*Argent*, 9 ad fin.), and Schiller (*Gesch. des dreissigjährigen Krieges*, Ed. 1).

[24. 4. R. Methner, *Der Konjunktiv in den Konsecutivsätzen mit Ut.*]

23. 5. 1909.

Th. Pluss, *Einheiten und Persönlichkeit im Homer*. Homer's poetic personality to be found in the subjective character of the style and the unity of the ideas and

feelings. E. Wilisch, *Der Kampf um das Schlachtfeld im Teutoburger Walde*. Summary (with maps) of the theories as to the site. J. Strzygowski, *Antike, Islam und Occident*. Refutes Thiersch's derivation of the minaret and Gothic steeple from the Pharos of Alexandria. E. Weber, *Carl Otfried Müller nach den Briefen, etc.* *Anzeigen und Mitteilungen*: J. Steinberger, *Die Marsyas-Gruppe des Myron*. Rejects Sauer's reconstruction (as given in *Jahrb. des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*, 1908, 3); Ritter's *Platon Dialoge. Inhaltsdarstellungen* II. 1. *Der Staat*, favourably noticed by W. Nestle; *Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon*, 1906-1907 (Athens, 1908), summarized by H. Lamer.

23. 6. 1909.

O. Stählin, *Editionstechnik*. Elaborate suggestions as to the manner in which critical texts of ancient literature should be edited—e.g., use of symbols in text, punctuation, use of the margins, indices. F. Marx, *Die Beziehungen des Allateins zum Spätlatein*. Evidence of modern languages, especially Spanish (*demas = de magis* of Lucil. 529, *hablar = fabulari, preguntat = percontari*). Festus' explanation of *atta = pater* confirmed by its use in this sense in Latin of the 9th century; the Pompeian form *opsclutat* (for *auscultat*) found in a monastic *regula* of the 6th century; *campare* in Ennius and the *Peregr. Siluiae*. Vitruvius' use of *gen.* for *abl.* (even in absolute construction) perhaps explains *aeris confessi rebusque indicatis* in the Twelve Tables. R. M. Meyer, *Die Poesie unter den bildenden Künsten*. *Anzeigen, etc.*: H. Blümner, *Kriterien zur Zeitbestimmung griechischer Skulpturen*. Brief summary of investigations as to treatment of eye and space between breasts.

23. 7. 1909.

F. Koepf, *Drei Probleme der griech. Künstlergeschichte*. (1) Amelung's identification of the original of the Ambelokipi relief with the Lemnian Athena, though not certain, is preferable to Furtwängler's well-known theory; (2) accepts Svoronos' identification of the Delphic charioteer with the Cyrene offering of Pausanias x. 15. 6; (3) is not convinced by Gardner's arguments against Lysippean authorship of the Apoxyomenos. R. Philippson, *Polystratos' Schrift Ueber die grundlose Verachtung der Volksmeinung*. Analysis. The opponents mentioned in it are the Cynics and, especially, contemporaries of Cynic tendency like Bion and Teles. The Plutarchean Gryllos reads like a satiric answer. A. Döring, *'Freiheit, die ich meine.'* *Anzeigen, etc.*: O. Immisch's *Wie studiert man klassische Philologie?* noticed by H. Peter, Rice Holmes' *Ancient Britain and the Invasions of Julius Caesar* very favourably reviewed by W. Schott: 'stimulating and instructive . . . fully equal, indeed superior, to its predecessor (the Conquest of Gaul).'

23. 8. 1909.

H. Lattmann, *Konjunktiv und Optativ*. Directed against Mutzbauer's '*Grundbedeutung des K. und O. . . im Griechischen.*' Does not think M.'s examples prove that the subj. denotes expectation rather than potentiality (the case being especially weak when *μὴ* accompanies it), or that the opt. is the mood of wish (even in dep. clauses after a past tense?) E. Bruhn, *Der Monolog im antiken Drama*. Summary of Leo's results in his essay with this title in *Abhandl. der Kgl. Gesellsch. der Wiss. zu Göttingen, Ph.-Hist. Klasse, N. F.* 10 5. F. Marx, *Die Entwicklung des röm. Hauses*. The Roman house, with *atrium* and *peristyle*, is clearly, like Roman culture, a combination of Etruscan and Greek influences. This double form came probably from Campania: by 160 B.C. the *peristyle* was a common feature, and is denoted in Roman writers by the phrases *pars interior (domus)* or the like. A. Klotz, *Die Schlacht von Munda*. Three accounts from eye-witnesses (Asinius Pollio = Plut.-App.; Hirtius = Livy; auctor Belli Hispaniensis) enable us to get a good idea of the battle. Labienus had to withdraw infantry from the fighting-line to meet the movement of Bogud's cavalry

towards his
literatur.
I. Band: T
lungen, de
E. Samter,
as very val
Die Sculptu
F. Koepf;
favourably

[24. 8
Ch. n.]

23. 9.

E. Pfu
stics and di
and the br
Kulte und il
the great i
the Alexan
colonists a
influence o
W. Sternke
but it is al
in Att. 4.
Anzeigen, et
Deutschland
stantial co

[24.
Grenzen un

23. 10.

F. W
The twofo
and livelin
nature in
rather tha
Art; Pind
Pythians
Electras o
suggests t
sister is a
Euripides
Pergamur
4th centur
of the mo
Lorenzo V
und Mittei
about 335
'Paralus
Antigonu
Apelles p
O. Meltze

towards his camp. B. Baumgarten, *Goethe über das Deutsche als Sprache der Weltliteratur. Anzeigen, etc.: Altorientalische Texte und Bilder zum Alten Testament. I. Band: Texte*, very favourably noticed by R. Stübe; E. Szanto, *Ausgewählte Abhandlungen*, described by F. Poland; S. Eitrem's *Hermes und die Toten*, reviewed by E. Samter, who rejects his theory that H. is a god of the dead, but regards the book as very valuable for all who are concerned with Greek religion; W. Amelung's *Die Sculpturen des Vat. Mus., Text* (2 vols.), *Tafeln* (2 vols.), favourably noticed by F. Koepp; P. R. Bienkowski's *Die Darstellungen der Gallier in der hellenist. Kunst*, favourably noticed by G. Weicker.

[24. 8. F. Schemmel, *Die Hochschule von Alexandria im IV und V Jahrhundert p. Ch. n.*]

23. 9. 1909

E. Pfuhl, *Die Wurzeln der hellenist. Kunst*. Description of its leading characteristics and discussion as to how far these appear in the prehistoric and archaic period, and the brilliant periods of the 5th and 4th centuries. T. Eisele, *Die phrygischen Kulte und ihr Bedeutung für die griechisch-römische Welt*. Totemistic and fetish stages; the great Mother, Attis, Sabazios, Men. Comparative failure of cult in Greece until the Alexandrian period; combination of κύριος Σαβάζιος and κύριος Σαβαώθ by Jewish colonists about 200 B.C.; success of the cult at home only one aspect of the general influence of the East upon the West. Description of the spring Attis festival. W. Sternkopf, *Cäsars gallischer Feldzug in Ciceros Briefen*. Various dates can be fixed, but it is almost impossible to adjust them to post-Julian calendar. *Hibernam legionem* in Att. 4. 19. 2 = 'a garrison command.' P. Simon, *Schiller's Gedicht 'Der Tanz.'* *Anzeigen, etc.*: A. Schaefer's *Die dramatischen Bearbeitungen der Pyramus-Thisbe-Sage in Deutschland im XVI und XVII Jahrhundert*, reviewed by E. Stemplinger: 'a substantial contribution to the literature on Ovid's influence on later ages.'

[24. 9. F. Friedrich, *Ostwalds Angriff auf die human. Schule*. O. Stange, *Grenzen und Ziele des Lateinunterrichts im Realgymnasium.*]

23. 10. 1909.

F. Winter, *Parallelscheinungen in der griech. Dichtkunst und bildenden Kunst*. The twofold nature of the Homeric simile, according as it describes nature with force and liveliness, or in general terms, corresponds to the difference in the treatment of nature in Creto-Mycenaean and early archaic Art. This points in favour of Reichel rather than v. Wilamowitz. Lyric poetry corresponds to the archaic period of Art; Pindar to the sculpture of the Zeus temple at Olympeia. (The 9th and 4th Pythians minutely examined from this point of view.) Aeschylus' *Choephores* and the *Electras* of Sophocles and Euripides. The composition of the Sophoclean play suggests the principles of the Parthenon sculptures; the introduction of the second sister is a 'Schönheitsmotiv' similar to those we find in them or contemporary work. Euripides' character-drawing reminds us of the 'bourgeoise' Athena statue of the Pergamum library, his later tendency to depict mental agony of the sculpture of the 4th century. P. E. Sonnenburg, *Zur Würdigung des Apollonios von Rhodos*. Account of the more attractive and interesting features of the *Argonautica*. J. Freudenthal, *Lorenzo Valla als Philosoph*. Relations to Aristotle, Plato, Epicurus, etc. *Anzeigen und Mitteilungen*: T. Schmid, *Zur Chronologie des Protagoras*. Born about 360, came about 335 to Athens, where he painted the portrait of Aristotle's mother (335-330), 'Paralus and Hammonias,' and 'The Thesmothetae' (330-325). The portrait of Antigonus belongs to 315-310, the 'Ialysus' was earlier than 305. The visit from Apelles perhaps 335; A. Mayr's *Die Insel Malta im Altertum*, favourably noticed by O. Meltzer.

Rheinisches Museum. 64. 2. 1909.

H. van Herwerden, *Spicilegium Dioneum*. Critical notes to Dio Cassius. O. Gilbert. *Ionier und Eleaten*. The Ionian conception of the Cosmos similar to that of Xenophanes, except that in the latter the divine substance is incapable of moving itself. Parmenides is at one with Xenophanes, Melissus differs from Parmenides in regarding the Cosmos as unlimited in space. C. Watzinger, *Vitruvstudien*. Close resemblance between V.'s divisions of Architecture and those of a Stoic theory of rhetoric probably due to Posidonius. A. Klotz, *Die Caesarüberlieferung*. The MSS. of Fam. α are derived from a copy of β , in which variants from an old MS. (containing only the B. G.) had been inserted. A. v. Mess, *Die Hellenika von Oxyrhynchus und die Berichte Xenophons und Diodors*. The accounts of Thibron's activity in 399 given by D. and X. not mutually exclusive, but supplementary; the common source probably the *Hellenika* of Oxyrhynchus. A study of the account of Agesilaus' first expedition and the war between Boeotia and Phocia in 395 in X. and the new *Hellenika* shows that X.'s narrative is summary, unscientific, and, where Agesilaus is concerned, too much inclined to panegyric. H. Mutschmann, *Die Ueberlieferung der Schriften des Sextus Empiricus*. 1. The MSS. 2. Relation of the MSS. to each other. 3. History of the text in the West. H. Rabe, *Aus Rhetoren-Handschriften*. 9. Greek Letter-books. Connected instructions first found in Philostratus and Gregory Nazianzene. The Libanius-Proclus treatise probably belongs to the 6th, the Pseudo-Demetrius one not later than the 10th, century. The *Ἐπιστολικὸν χαρακτήρος σύνοψις* probably belongs to the 15th. A. Brinkmann, *Der älteste Briefsteller*. The *τίποις ἐπιστολικὸν* ascribed to Demetrius of Phalerum originated in Egypt between the 2nd cent. a.c. and the middle of the 1st cent. of our era. *Miscellen*: R. Asmus, *Zur Textkritik von Julian or. V*; H. van Herwerden, *Ad Libanii orationes, Vol. IV. ed. Förster*; G. Mercati, *A proposito di un' oscura sottoscrizione*. In the mysterious subscription to certain 'corrections' to Simplicius' commentary on Aristotle's Physics, found in a Vatican MS., the figures denote not the age of the MS. used, but the number of 'corrections' borrowed. D. P. may stand for Donato Poli; A. Klotz, *Das Ordnungsprinzip in Vergils Bucolica*. Dramatic and narrative idylls alternate: Ecl. 7 is a narrative of a dramatic scene. Cp. the Theocritus scholia with their labels *δραματικόν, διηγηματικόν*; C. Weyman, *Zum carmen de figuris*. Ll. 139 sqq. contain reminiscences of not only Cato *Orig.* fr. 108, but Afran. 140 R⁸, Hor. *Sat.* 1. 4. 131 sqq.; Idem, *Zu Ambrosius*. In Ambr. *De Elia* 6. 18 *ineptis siluestribus hospitalis humanitatis implebat officium* read *inemptis* (Verg. G. 4. 132); *oleribus* (so the old Paris MS.) *siluestribus*, etc.; Idem, *Vexare*. Means 'kill' in an inscription; J. Cholodniak, *Zu Petronius*. In *Sat.* 30 read *quorum imam partem*, in 46 for *dispare pallauit* read **disparpallauit* (Italian *sparpagliari*, French *éparpiller*); J. M. Stahl, *Ἐσομαι—ero*. Not future subjunctives, but present ind. with future force; S. Eitrem, *Hermes, Πολύγισος*. II. = Πολυγύγιος; E. Ziebarth, *Zum 'Gasthaus der Römer und Richter' in Sparta*.

64. 3. 1909.

C. Meister, *De itinerrario Aetheriae abbatissae perperam nomini s. Siluiae addicte*. Gamurrini's proofs that the pilgrimage was undertaken at the end of the 4th century refuted: it took place after 533 and before 540. Aetheria a native of Narbonnese Gaul: it is difficult to find traces of her natural tongue, as her style is 'learned,' being influenced by the sacred writings: note, however, *absolvere* = 'break fast' (*ascioluere*), *se facere* for *fieri*, etc. T. Birt, *Zur Monobiblos und zum Codex N des Propertii*. The so-called Bk. 1 was a separate publication, like Martial's *liber spectaculorum*; the real Bk. 1 of his 'Complete Works' is represented, probably in selection, by poems 1-11 of what is now called Bk. 2. Orthographical and other peculiarities of m. 2 in N., etc. etc. Discussion of passages of Bk. 2 (e.g. 25.17, 22.48 sqq., 12.17 sqq.,

9.17 sqq. N. *Perikeiromenon* after l. 70, i. converses pretation of dialogue between full' in Ath. papyri and names in V. of a gens, a Vitumnus ('form Card. Juno at the Miscellen: 7. tione; G. M. In quarto sili right; Ide called Dio ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟ Alexandria ἀγαθὸν βαρ mann, Die number; passage in

64. 4.

E. Pe P.'s book r Discussion 5.10, and th Introductio arranged o one based 'Three-me Paris. 292 schichte He pseudo-Ion Aristarchu of editors position. poverty; l parts of th passage. περί πλοῦτος the conclu Interpreta p. 932c to πάθος, ἀλλ Vorlesung to the abli Lückenbüßs 7. Two fr NO. I.

9.17 sqq. N. intended to form part of a collective MS. S. Sudhaus, *Der Kampf um die Perikeiromene*. Reconstruction, etc.: e.g. conjecture as to the contents of the gap after l. 70, interpretation of ll. 447 sqq., suggestion that the person with whom Doris converses 479 sqq. is Pataecus. W. Crönert, *Das Lied von Marisa*. Text and interpretation of Greek inscription on a tomb near the ancient M. in Judaea. It is a dialogue between a wife and her paramour: cp. the Δορκικάι ὠδαί of which Phoenicia is full in Athen. 15. 697b. C. collects all examples he knows of Ionic verses in Egyptian papyri and inscriptions. W. F. Otto, *Röm. 'Sondergotter'*. Some of the most difficult names in Vario's list explicable on the theory that they are connected with the name of a gens, and denote the god worshipped by that gens: so e.g. *Caeculus* (Caecilii), *Vitumnus* (Vitellii), *Sentinus* (Sentii: whence Sentinum). The goddess Carna (the form Cardea has no real authority) is the goddess of the Carn(i)i. Cult of Janus and Juno at the Tigillum sororium a purificatory one, in the hands of the gens *Horatia*. *Miscellen*: T. Birt, *Zu Cic. ad Att.* 4. 5. 5. Read *cum structura* (= shelves) for *constructione*; G. Némethy, *Coniecturae in Tibullum*; A. Klotz, *Der Titel von Statius Silvae*. In *quarto siluarum* shews that each poem is a silua: the old explanation 'sketch' is right; Idem., *zu Dionys. Periegetes*. In a passage in Guido of Pisa, where he is called Dionysius Ionicus, the epithet is perhaps due to misunderstanding of ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ. Guido's words then confirm the suggestion that he was son of the Alexandrian grammarian; S. Sudhaus, *Philodemeum*. Notes on *Περὶ τοῦ καθ' Ὀμηρον ἀγαθοῦ βασιλέως*, columns x and xxv; H. Schöne, *Zu den Aratscholien*; H. Mutschmann, *Die Ueberlieferung der Schriften des Sext. Emp.* Addenda to his article in last number; A. Brinkmann, *Lückenbüsser*. *θρίαμβος* 'publication'; emendation of a passage in Phlegon; punctuation of one in Theodoret.

64. 4. 1909.

E. Petersen, *Pausanias der Perieget*. Maintains, against Robert, the view that P.'s book represents a connected tour, in which the author leads one from place to place. Discussion of many details, especially the pinacotheca of l. 22. 6, the Zeus temple of 5.10, and the account of Delphi. H. Rabe, *Aus Rhetoren-Handschriften*. 10. General Introductions fall into three classes—one with a ten chapter arrangement, one arranged on same principle as Aristotle's categories (generally three, not four, fold), one based on a combination of grammatical and philosophical principles. 11. The 'Three-men' Commentary of Walz, 4 pp. 1 sqq. Analysis and corrections from Paris. 2923. 12. A Hermagoras MS. at Sofia. W. Aly, *Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte Herodots*. Epic forms a prominent feature of the Romanus class, and certain pseudo-Ionisms occur mainly there. AB represent a new revision of the ed. of Aristarchus, RVS the vulgate, strongly influenced by it, but owing much to the hands of editors of the second century of our era. F. Jacoby, *Tibulls erste Elegie*. 1. Composition. Three motives: ll. 7-24 war and peace; ll. 25-44 former wealth, present poverty; ll. 57-74 glory and love. The first two form the bucolic, the last the erotic parts of the poem: each of the three distinctly hints at the motive of the succeeding passage. 2. Tibullus and the Diatribe. Influence of diatribe with such τόποι as that *περί πλούτου* on the poem: to this due the lack of reference to the erotic motive in the concluding lines of the poem. *Miscellen*: W. Crönert, *Ein Epigramm des Nikarchos*. Interpretation of A.P. 5. 40; R. Kunze, *Zu Plutarch de fac. in orbe lunae*. Emends on p. 932c to *ἐκλειψίς ἔστιν ἡ λίου σύνοδος σκιᾷ σελήνης, τὴν ἐκλείψιν <οὐκ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἁστρου πάθος, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας ὀψεως εἶναι ὁρθῶς λέγει>*. *ἐκείνοις γὰρ, κ.τ.λ.*; W. Aly, *Herodots Vorlesung in Athen*. The statement that H. received 10 talents is a misconception due to the abbreviation X.: 600 drachmae would be natural enough; A. Brinkmann, *Lückenbüsser*. 6. *ἄνδρες σοφοὶ Μουσῶν ὑποφῆται* in Constantinus Manasses = Herodotus. 7. Two fragments of Teucer of Cyzicus.

Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie. 1909.

- 7 June. Fr. Poulsen, *Recherches sur quelques questions relatives à la topographie de Delphes* (A. Trendelenburg). 'Stimulating, and founded on thorough knowledge.' E. W. Hope, *The Language of Parody* (—r.), favourable. L. Bloch, *Soziale Kämpfe im alten Rom*. 2 Aufl. (Fr. Cauer), favourable. Fr. Rabenald, *Quaestiones Solimanarum capita tria* (J. Müller). 'The results will be accepted.' E. Gollob, *Die Bibliothek des Jesuiten Kollegiums in Wien XIII. und ihre Handschriften* (M. Manitius). O. Immisch, *Wie studiert man klassische Philologie?* (R. Wagner), very favourable.
- 14 June. W. Deonna, *Les Apollons archaïques* (A. Trendelenburg), very favourable. O. Moessner, *Die Mythologie in der dorischen und attischen Komödie* (W.), favourable. K. Conradt, *Die Grundlagen der griechischen Orchestik und Rhythmik* (K. Löschhorn), very favourable. M. Schlossarek, *Temporum et modorum syntaxis Terentiana*, I. (F. Gustafsson), favourable on the whole. G. Giarratano, *De Martialis re metrica* (H. G.). 'Careful and thorough.'
- 21 June. R. Meringer, W. Meyer-Lübke, J. J. Mikkola, R. Much, M. Murko, *Wörter und Sachen*. Kulturhistorische Zeitschrift (E. Zupitza). E. Cicotti, *Indirizzi e metodi degli studi di demografia antica* (Fr. Cauer), favourable. *Euphorionis fragmenta*, scr. F. Schneidweiler (J. Sitzler). 'Shows diligence and circumspection.' Guil. Stahl, *De bello Sertoriano* (Soltau), very favourable. H. Polstorff, *Lexikalische Studien zu den Satiren Juvenals* (K. Löschhorn), favourable. *Thesaurus linguae latinae*. Supplem. fasc. I. *Nomina propria C—Carine* (A. Zimmermann).
- 28 June. H. Weber, *Attisches Prozessrecht in den attischen Seebundstaaten* (Fr. Cauer), favourable. V. Macchioro, *Ceramica sardofenicia nel museo civico di Pavia* (P. Goessler). E. Wendling, *Die Entstehung des Marcus-Evangeliums* (Soltau), favourable. J. Gabrielsson, *Ueber die Quellen des Clemens Alexandrinus*. II. (J. Dräseke), very favourable. *Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religions* (K. Budde).
- 5 July. P. Cauer, *Grundfragen der Homerkritik*. 2 Aufl. (Chr. Harder), very favourable. A. Schwarzstein, *Eine Gebäudegruppe in Olympia* (A. Trendelenburg), very unfavourable. A. Egen, *Die beiden Theseuslieder des Bakchylides* (K. Löschhorn), favourable. V. Macchioro, *Ricerche demografiche intorno ai colombari* (P. Goessler). 'Clear and farseeing.' G. Zottoli, *Publio Paquio Proculo panattiere e supremo magistrato Pompeiano* (H. Dessau), favourable.
- 12 July. J. J. Thomopoulos, *Ἰθάκη καὶ Ὀμηρος*. I. 'H' Ὀμηρικῇ Ἰθάκῃ und *Ithaka und Homer*. I. *Das homerische Ithaka* (P. Goessler), unfavourable. R. M. E. Meister, *Eideshelfer im griechischen Rechte* (Fr. Cauer), favourable. *Mitteilungen der Altertums-Kommission für Westfalen*. V. (H. Nöthe). H. L. Wilson, *Latin Inscriptions at the Johns Hopkins University* (H. Dessau).
- 19 July. A. van Gennep, *La question d'Homère* (R. Wagner), favourable. C. Robert, *Der neue Menander* (K. F. W. Schmidt). 'A furtherance of the study.' C. B. Williams, *The Participle in the Book of Acts* (E. Fränkel). 'A diligent and useful dissertation.' T. E. Euangelides, *Ἡ νῆσος Σίβυρος* (J. Dräseke), very favourable. P. O. Rottmanner, *Geistesfrüchte aus der Klosterzelle*, herausg. von R. Jud (J. Dräseke), very favourable.
- 26 July. W. Michel, *De fabularum Graecarum argumentis metricis* (J. Wagner). 'Good and stimulating.' K. Kiefer, *Körperlicher Schmerz und Tod auf der attischen Bühne* (S. Mekler), favourable. L. Bodin et P. Mazon, *Extraits de Ménandre* (K. F. W. Schmidt), favourable. E. Menozzi, *Sull' 'Hpos di Menandro* (K. F. W. Schmidt). 'We have too little evidence to come to a safe conclusion.' M. Naechster, *De Pollucis et Phrynichi controversiis* (E. Althaus), favourable. Ph. Fabia, *L'atènement officiel de Tibère* (H. Nohl), favourable. Tacitus, *The Agricola* (D. R. Stuart), favourable. D. Cancogni, *Le rovine del Palatino* (Köhler), favourable.

9 Aug.
ing and les
Aristophanes
Bildern, her
πολιορκητικο
Schneider (H.
antica (H. N.
16 Aug
favourable.
H. J. Müll
Untersuchun
30 Aug
in Verbind
reliable gui
edition of F
des Ansoniu
(M. Manitiu
compositione
6 Sept
'An excell
History of
ed. by W.
Criticism
able. H.
(F. Gustaf
13 Se
favourable
homerische
der Philoso
standpoint
(3) Fronto
'Vergilio'
'Shows th
20 Se
Wissensch
Greek Sign
der römisch
Otio, par
J. Vürthei
usu in eph
A. Riehl,
(tz). 'Ri
27 S
Periherom
Zur Gesch
unfavourab
mann, De
4 Oc
tribution.
J. May,
(Th. Ziel
on the w
favourab

9 Aug. M. Pieper, *Das Brettspiel der alten Ägypter* (A. Wiedemann). 'Interesting and learned.' R. T. Elliott, *Some Contributions to the Textual Criticisms of Aristophanes and Aeschylus* (E. Wüst), favourable. *Geschütze auf handschriftlichen Bildern*, herausg. von R. Schneider; 'Ἀπολλοδώρου Πολιορκητικά und Παραγγέλματα πολιορκητικά', herausg. von R. Schneider; *Ἀνώνυμι de rebus bellicis liber*, von R. Schneider (R. Oehler), favourable. E. Pais, *Ricerche storiche e geografiche sull' Italia antica* (H. Nissen), favourable.

16 Aug. B. L. Gildersleeve, *Notes on Stahl's Syntax of the Greek Verb* (J. Sitzler), favourable. T. Livi *abu. c. libri*. Weissenborns erklärende Ausgabe neu bearb. von H. J. Müller, IX. 1, Buch 39 und 40. 3 Aufl. (Ed. Wolff). E. Dannhäuser, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Probus* (W. Thiele), favourable.

30 Aug. H. Gressmann, *Altorientalische Texte und Bilder zum Alten Testamente*, in Verbindung mit A. Ungnad und H. Ranke, herausg. I. II. (C. Fries). 'A reliable guide.' Sophocles, *The Electra*, with a commentary abridged from the larger edition of R. C. Jebb by G. A. Davies (H. Steinberg), favourable. *Die Moselgedichte des Ansonius und des Fortunatus*, zum 2. Male herausg. und erkl. von C. Hosius (M. Manitius), favourable. O. Wischniewski, *De Prisciani institutionum grammaticarum compositione* (J. Tolkienn). 'Rich in results.'

6 Sept. L. Pareti, *Ricerche sulla potenza marittima degli Spartani* (H. Swoboda). 'An excellent performance.' Th. Fitzhugh, *Supplement to the Prolegomena to the History of Italo-Romanic Rhythm, Carmen Arvale* (H. G.). Lucreti, *De rerum natura*, ed. by W. A. Merrill (H. Belling), very favourable. W. H. Alexander, *Some Textual Criticisms on the Eighth Book of the De vita Caesarum of Suetonius* (Th. Opitz), favourable. H. Martin, *Notes on the Syntax of the Latin Inscriptions found in Spain* (F. Gustafsson). 'Very important for vulgar Latin.'

13 Sept. E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*. 2 Aufl. I. 2 (Fr. Cauer), very favourable. C. Mutzbauer, *Die Grundlagen der griechischen Tempuslehre und der homerische Tempusgebrauch*. II. (H. G.), favourable. R. Richter, *Der Skeptizismus in der Philosophie und seine Überwindung*. II. (A. Bonhöffer). 'Takes the right general standpoint.' P. Rasi, (1) *Analecta Horatiana per saturam*. (2) *L'accusativo con 'nescius'*. (3) *Frontonianum*. (4) *Alter rixatur de lana saepe caprina (a proposito di 'Virgilio' o 'Vergilio')* (Petri), favourable. St. Lösch, *Die Einsiedler Gedichte* (M. Manitius). 'Shows the way of solution.'

20 Sept. A. Trendelenburg, *Ein Talisman*. Blätter für die Mitglieder des Wissenschaftlichen Zentral-Vereins. Nr. I. (E. Wilisch). J. A. Scott, *Studies in Greek Sigmata* (J. Sitzler). 'A worthy contribution.' W. Soltau, *Die Anfänge der römischen Geschichtsschreibung* (H. Nissen), favourable on the whole. Sénèque, *De Otio*, par R. Waltz (W. Gemoll), rather unfavourable. *Octavia praetexta*, ed. J. Vürtheim (W. Gemoll), unfavourable. R. Lackner, *De casuum temporum modorum usu in ephemeride Dictyis-Septimii* (C. Stegmann). 'Valuable for collection of material.' A. Riehl, *Humanistische Ziele des mathematischen und naturwissenschaftlichen Unterrichts* (tz). 'Rich in ideas.'

27 Sept. A. Körte, *Zu dem Menander-Papyrus in Kairo und Zwei neue Blätter der Perikeiromene* (K. F. W. Schmidt), favourable. K. Lehmann, *Hannibals Alpenweg und Zur Geschichte der Barkiden*. I. *Hannibals Alpenübergang als Marschleistung* (Fr. Reuss), unfavourable. *Ovidii Amores*, ed. G. Némethy (H. Belling), unfavourable. H. Lietzmann, *Der Weltkainand* (L. Hahn), very favourable.

4 Oct. J. Geffcken, *Kynika und Verwandtes* (W. Nestle). 'A very worthy contribution.' Fr. Sandgathe, *Die Wahrheit der Kriterien Epikurs* (A. Döring), favourable. J. May, *Rhythmische Formen, nachgewiesen durch Beispiele aus Cicero und Demosthenes* (Th. Zielinski), unfavourable. R. Waltz, *Vie de Sénèque* (G. Andresen), favourable on the whole. Grégoire de Nysse, *Discours catéchétique*, par L. Méridier (J. Dräseke), favourable.

11 Oct. *Thukydides*, erkl. von J. Classen. 7 Band, VII. Buch, 3 Aufl. von J. Steup (P. Widmann). O. Willmann, *Aristoteles als Pädagog und Didaktiker* (W. Nestle). 'To be recommended.' H. Guhrauer, *Etwas von altgriechischer Musik* (K. Löschhorn). 'Very well worth consideration.' B. L. Ullman, *The Identification of the Manuscripts of Catullus cited in Statius' edition of 1556* (H. Belling). 'Of use for the history of philology.' *Ciris, Epyllion pseudo-Vergilianum*, ed. G. Némethy (F. Skutsch), unfavourable. Th. Stangl, *Pseudo-asconiana* (Schmiedeburg), favourable. Th. Litt, *Lucians philosophische Entwicklung* (P. Schulze), very favourable.

18 Oct. R. R. Marett, *Anthropology and the Classics*. Six lectures delivered before the University of Oxford by A. J. Evans, A. Lang, G. Murray, F. B. Jevons, J. L. Myres, and W. W. Fowler (Fr. Cauer), favourable. M. Engers, *De Aegyptiarum κομῶν administratione qualis fuerit aetate Lagidarum* (A. Wiedemann). 'A valuable contribution to our knowledge.' H. L. Axtell, *The Deification of Abstract Ideas in Roman Literature and Inscriptions* (H. Steuding), favourable. E. Pfretzschner, *Die Grundrissentwicklung der römischen Thermen* (Köhler). 'A very useful book.' W. Brandes, *Beiträge zu Ausonius. IV. Die Ephemeris—ein Mimus* (R. E. Ottmann), favourable. G. Mau, *Die Religionsphilosophie Kaiser Julians* (J. Dräseke), very favourable.

25 Oct. G. Radet, *Cybbê* (S. Wide), favourable. N. Pawlatos, 'Ἡ ὀμνηρὴ Ἰθάκη' (W. Becher). 'Against Dörpfeld and his followers.' J. A. Stewart, *Plato's Doctrine of Ideas* (R. Adam), favourable. C. Ritter, *Platons Staat*. 'Very painstaking.' *Tibulle et les auteurs du Corpus Tibullianum*, par A. Cartault (H. Belling). 'Satisfies a great need.' Fr. Lohr, *Das Marsfeld* (Forts.) (Köhler), favourable. J. Kurth, *Aus Pompeji* (Köhler). 'May be recommended to all travellers.' K. Krumbacher, *Kritik. Ein lexikographischer Versuch* (G. Wartenberg).

1 Nov. G. van Hoorn, *De vita atque cultu puerorum* (H. Blümner), favourable. H. Diels, *Herakleitos von Ephesos*. 2 Aufl. (A. Döring), very favourable. K. Gleisberg, *De vocabulis tragicis quae apud Platonem inveniuntur* (H. Gillischewski). 'A very respectable performance.' *Fontes iuris Romani antiqui*, ed. G. Bruns, septimum ed. O. Gradenwitz (E. Grupe). 'This well-known and valued collection.' F. Knoke, *Armin der Befreier Deutschlands* (E. Wilisch), very favourable.

8 Nov. L. Szczepański, *Nach Petra und zum Sinai* (A. Wiedemann), very favourable. *Tätigkeitsbericht des Vereins Klassischer Philologen zu Wien*: of particular interest are J. Keil, *Zur erythraischen Priestertümerverkaufsinschrift*, and R. Meister, *Beiträge zur Lautlehre der Septuaginta* (E. Fränkel). *Thucydides*, by E. C. Marchant, Book III. (S. P. Widmann), favourable. A. Siegmund, *Thukydides und Aristoteles über die Oligarchie des Jahres 411 in Athen* (Schneider), favourable. J. Lange, *Alesia* (J. Dräseke). 'A meritorious dissertation.' V. Chapot, *La frontière de l'Euphrate* (A. Schulten). 'Diligent, but wanting in method.' F. X. Zeller, *Die Zeit Kommodians* (W. Thiele), very favourable. F. Gaffiot, *Pour le vrai Latin* (Th. Stangl), favourable on the whole. H. C. Lipscomb, *Aspects of the Speech in the Later Roman Epic* (J. Ziehen). 'Has a certain statistical value.' D. B. Monro. A short memoir, translated from a notice by J. Cook Wilson (J. Ziehen). 'A man of decisive influence in England.'

15 Nov. *Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expedition to Syria. III. Greek and Latin Inscriptions*. Sec. B 2 and 3, by W. K. Prentice (W. Larfeld). 'Of the highest value.' F. Meyerhoefer, *Über die Schlüsse der erhaltenen griechischen Tragödien* (S. Mekler), unfavourable. H. Bergfeld, *De versu Saturnio* (H. G.), favourable. L. Vischi, *Laocoonte: Due episodi dell'Eneide. L'Eneide: Testo e versione ritmica* (H. D.), favourable. J. Toutain, *Le cadastre de l'Afrique romaine* (W. Barthel), favourable. J. Bidez, *La tradition manuscrite de Sozomène et la tripartite de Théodore le Lecteur* (J. Dräseke), very favourable.

22 Nov. *Katálogos* (W. Larfeld). care and and griechischen 'Not unsu zum Beginn

29 Nov. *ἱεργητικὰ* *pateras* (J. Sueciana, ed.

6 Dec. (H. G.)

Behandlung *fertur apol*

De Pluti A G. Jachm

griechischen too much

rather unde *de lege agr*

rec. A. C. *Poësis Lat*

13 Dec. able. F.

Book Divi cur. J. S.

figurazioni 'Apopuoi

Kirchenges und Th.

20 Jan. Hirzel, I

Mensch us in official

Bericht d *Limes in*

nach den *Talmud* (E. Frän

27 Jan. S. Copal

and inte (M. Mar

humanisti von E. C.

3 Aufl. von
idaktiker (W.
hischer Musik
Identification
'Of use for
Nemethy (F.
, favourable.
e.

res delivered
F. B. Jevons,
Aegyptiarum
'A valuable
tract Ideas in
zuschner, Die
book.' W.
ottmann),
äseke), very

, 'H ὁμηρικῇ
wart, Plato's
pains-taking.'
'Satisfies a
Kurth, Aus
cher, Kritik.

favourable.
K. Gleisberg,
r. 'A very
optimum ed.
F. Knoke,

very favour-
ular interest
er, Beiträge
t, Book III.
eles über die
t, Alesia (J.
l'Euphrate
Zeit Kom-
h. Stangl),
ater Roman
ort memoir,
ve influence

on to Syria.
f. Larfeld).
griechischen
,), favour-
e versione
f. Barthel),
Théodore la

22 Nov. A. S. Arvanitopoulos, 'Η σημασία τῶν γραπτῶν στηλῶν Παγασῶν and Κατάλογος τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀθνασκειῇ Μουσείῳ Βόλου ἀρχαιοτήτων. Πρώτη αἰθουσα, 1-41 (W. Larfeld). J. E. Harry, *Studies in Euripides' Hippolytus* (K. Busche). 'Shows care and circumspection.' K. Krumbacher, *Das Programm des neuen Thesaurus der griechischen Sprache* (E. Fränkel), favourable. F. C. Wick, *Sepulcralia* (Fr. Harder). 'Not unsuccessful.' M. Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode. I. Bis zum Beginn des 12. Jahrhunderts* (J. Dräseke), very favourable.

29 Nov. J. Roiron, *Étude sur l'imagination auditive de Virgile* and Κριτικά καὶ ἰζηγητικά περὶ τινῶν Οἰαργυλίων στίχων (P. Jahn), very favourable. A. Elter, *Donarem pateras* (J. Häussner), on Hor. Od. IV. 8, favourable. *Eranos: Acta philologica Suecana*, edenda cur. V. Lundström. Vol. VI. (J. Ziehen).

6 Dec. J. A. Scott, *The Influence of Metre on the Homeric Choice of Dissyllables* (H. G.). On λόγος, νόμος, and σοφός, favourable. N. Wecklein, *Über die dramatische Behandlung des Telephosmythus* (R. Wagner), favourable. O. Frick, *Xenophonitis quae fertur apologia Socratis num genuina sit* (O. Immisch), very favourable. W. Laible, *De Plauti Aristophaneae aetate interpretes antiqui quid indicaverint* (E. Wüst), unfavourable. G. Jachmann, *De Aristotelis didascalii* (E. Wüst), favourable. E. Ziebarth, *Aus dem griechischen Schulwesen. Endemos von Milet und Verwandtes* (W. Larfeld). 'Attempts too much.' C. Bione, *I più antichi trattati di arte retorica in lingua latina* (M. Stangl), rather unfavourable. Ciceronis orationes pro Quinctio, pro Roscio comedo, pro Caccina, de lege agraria contra Rullum, pro Rabirio, pro Flacco, in Pisonem, pro C. Rabirio postumo, rec. A. C. Clark (J. K. Schönberger). 'A work of lasting merit.' F. Plessis, *La Poésie Latine de Livius Andronicus à Rutilius Namatianus* (J. Ziehen), favourable.

13 Dec. M. P. Nilsson, *Timbres amphoriques de Lindos* (A. Köster), very favourable. F. Hoeber, *Griechische Vasen* (O. Engelhardt), favourable. B. L. Ullman, *The Book Division of Propertius* (H. Belling), favourable. *Taciti Cn. Julii Agricolae vita*, cur. J. S. Allen (Ed. Wolff). 'Without any value.' V. Macchioro, *Il simbolismo nelle figurazioni sepolcrali romane* (J. Ziehen), favourable. P. Heseler, *Zu Porphyrius' Schrift Ἀφορμαὶ πρὸς τὰ νοητά* (J. Dräseke). 'Fourteen pages full of learning.' *Eusebius' Kirchengeschichte mit der lateinischen Übersetzung des Rufinus*, herausg. von E. Schwartz und Th. Mommsen. II. 3 (J. Dräseke), very favourable.

20 Dec. W. Aly, *Der Kretische Apollonkult* (H. Steuding), favourable. R. Hirzel, *Die Strafe der Steinigung* (B. v. Hagen). 'A mine of learning.' A. Stahl, *Mensch und Welt. Epikur und die Stoa* (J. Dräseke). 'May be recommended to those in official life.' E. Reuter, *De Avieni hexametrorum re metrica* (H. G.), favourable. *Bericht des Vereins Carnuntum in Wien für die Jahre 1906 und 1907 und Der römische Limes in Österreich. Heft X.* (P. Goessler). H. Blaufuss, *Römische Feste und Feiertage nach den Traktaten über fremden Dienst in Mischna, Tosefta, Jerusalem und babylonischen Talmud* (L. Hahn), favourable. P. Becker, *De Photio et Aretha lexicorum scriptoribus* (E. Fränkel). 'A very interesting dissertation.'

27 Dec. *Theophrasti Characteres*, rec. H. Diels (A. Zingerle), very favourable. S. Copalle, *De servorum Graecorum nominibus capita duo* (E. Fränkel). 'A very diligent and interesting dissertation.' J. Ziehen, *Neue Studien zur lateinischen Anthologie* (M. Manitius), very favourable. *Veröffentlichungen der Vereinigung der Freunde des humanistischen Gymnasiums in Berlin und der Provinz Brandenburg. I. Heft.* Herausg. von E. Grünwald (Th. Opitz).

ARCHAEOLOGICAL.

American Journal of Archaeology. XII. Part 4. 1908.

H. N. Fowler, *Charles Eliot Norton* (obituary notice). G. P. Stevens, *The Cornice of the Temple of Athena Nike* (ten cuts). Identifies the cornice assigned by Daumet to the Nike temple as the raking cornice of the north portico of the Erechtheum. J. M. Paton, *The Death of Thersites on an Apulian Amphora in the Boston Museum* (plate, two cuts). The vase represents Achilles in an *aedicula*, with the decapitated body of Thersites before him. The story varies from those in the known literary versions, and seems to suggest that told by Harpocration, s.v. *φάρμακος*, in which Thersites was punished for theft. O. S. Tonks, *Experiments with the Black Glaze on Greek Vases*. Claims to have solved the problem of its nature; denies that the red is a glaze, but the black is of that character, made from clay combined with iron and soda. F. B. Tarbell, *A White Athenian Lecythus belonging to the University of Chicago* (cut). An unusual type, with lines of thin glaze on brownish slip, about 450 B.C.; subject, three stelae on a pedestal, with names (of members of a family) inscribed. D. M. Robinson and W. N. Bates, *Notes on Vases in Philadelphia*. Discussing an amphora by Meno (*Noel des Vergers*, iii. pl. 9). A. L. Frothingham, *The Real Title of Botticelli's Pallas*. Pallas is to be interpreted as Florentia. *Archaeological Discussions*, ed. W. N. Bates. Supplementary Part: *Annual Reports of American Schools and Archaeological Institute*.

XIII. Part 1. 1909.

H. N. Fowler, *John Henry Wright* (obituary notice). J. C. Rolfe, *Two Etruscan Mirrors* (seven cuts). One from Fidenae represents Peleus and Thetis, the latter winged; the other from Fescenninum or Falerii, the three Cabeiri. J. B. Carter, *The Death of Romulus*. The Romulus legend is of late date, and the story of his death is not known before the third century; but no form of it accounts for the grave in the Forum. Probably this monument is an altar at which the *rex* performed his functions, and the *lex arae* was written on the *niger lapis*. D. M. Robinson, *An Oenophorus belonging to the Johns Hopkins University* (six cuts). Resembles G186 in British Museum; subject, the Dioscuri with horses. On the foot is incised *οἰνοφάρος* (which explains the word as used in *Hor. Sat. I. 6, 109*). A. L. Frothingham, *A Pseudo-Roman Relief in the Uffizi—a Renaissance Forgery* (cut). Represents an imperial sacrifice; date probably latter half of fifteenth century. Ch. Hülsen, *The Burning of Rome under Nero*. Considers the fire due to accident, not to the Emperor. *General Meeting of Archaeological Institute* (summaries of papers read). *Archaeological News*, ed. W. N. Bates.

Part 2.

W. Dennison, *An Inscription of the 'Labicani Quintanenses'* (cut). This inscription at Frascati, partly erased in antiquity, had been previously misread; Quintanas was a posting-station fifteen miles from Rome, not on the site of Labicum, though the people were known by this title. H. A. Sanders, *The Age and Ancient Home of the Biblical MSS. in the Freer Collection* (three plates). Mary H. Swindler, *Another Vase by the Master of the Penthesilea Cylinx* (seven cuts). Vase at Philadelphia, with signature of Nikosthenes on foot, which does not belong; subjects, youth pursuing maiden and departure scenes. (See Furtwaengler, *Gr. Vasenm.* i. p. 283.) W. N. Bates, *A Head of Heracles in the style of Scopas* (plate, three cuts). A head from Sparta at Philadelphia resembling those from Tegea. Elizabeth M. Gardner, *A Series of Sculptures from Corinth* (plate, two cuts). Fragments of fifth-century sepulchral reliefs. Esther

B. van Der
the whole
restoration
Discussions,

Athen

The O
plates, eigh
with build
south-easte
gymnasion
bathroom,
pronaos, da
supplemen
Seventy in
inscriptions
style of al
like plaite
Hellenistic
(4) P. Sch
found in 19
drinking li
Pediment.
gives addit

Jahrh

H
B. Sa
Marsyas a
types may
Brunn is
H. Thiers
medallion
R. Zahn,
the one pu
and R. F.
Group of A
(H. Thiers
Boston Mus
graphy.

Heft

G. Kr
article (19
a wooden
weapons in
Phoenissae
G104 in
exactly cor
ropevrijs.
difficulty o
heads is or

B. van Deman, *The so-called Flavian Rostra* (seven cuts). Accepts Richter's view that the whole is a single structure, except the hemicycle, which belongs to a later restoration; in all, four architectural periods can be recognized. *Archaeological Discussions*, ed. W. N. Bates. *Bibliography of Archaeological Books* (id.).

Athenische Mitteilungen. XXXIII. Heft 4. 1908.

The Operations at Pergamon, 1906-07: (1) W. Dörpfeld, *The Buildings* (five plates, eight cuts). The principal buildings explored were the upper gymnasium, with buildings adjoining on west, the temple (R) on the height to the west, the south-eastern town wall, a bridge over the Selinus, and tumuli. West part of gymnasium (γυμνάσιον τῶν νέων) now uncovered, completing the court, with theatres, bathroom, etc., all of Greek period. Temple dedicated to Asklepios, prostyle with pronaos, dating from regal period, and showing transition from Doric to Ionic. A supplement deals with operations in 1908. (2) P. Jacobsthal, *Inscriptions* (plate). Seventy in all published, including decrees, lists of ephebi, honorary and sepulchral inscriptions. (3) P. Jacobsthal, *Minor Finds* (three plates and cut). Marble torso in style of altar-frieze, probably the cult statue of the temple; pillar, with ornament like plaited straw, round which is plane-wreath; terracotta figure of Asklepios; Hellenistic pottery; gold ornaments and bronze sword from sarcophagus in tumulus. (4) P. Schazmann, *Wall-Paintings in the House of the Consul Attalos* (cut). Frescoes found in 1906, in the style of Pompeii (first period) and Prima Porta; one has doves drinking like the mosaic of Sosos. B. Sauer, *The Middle Group of the Parthenon East Pediment*. Further comments on Prandtl's article (*A. M.*, 1908, p. 1 ff.; cf. p. 101 ff.); gives additional reasons for rejecting the hovering Nike in this position.

Jahrbuch des deutschen archäologischen Instituts. XXIII. 1908. Heft 3.

B. Sauer, *Myron's Marsyas Group* (two plates, thirteen cuts). Copies of group of Marsyas and Athena discussed, and types on coins compared with sculptures. Two types may be recognized as representing the group seen by Pausanias at Athens, and Brunn is probably right in connecting this with the Marsyas mentioned by Pliny. H. Thiersch, *Lysippos' Alexander with the Spear* (four cuts). Claims as genuine a gold medallion from Aboukir with this subject, and refers it to an original by Lysippos. R. Zahn, *Sarcophagus from Clazomenae in the Berlin Museum* (three cuts). Describes the one published in *Ant. Denkm.*, ii. pl. 58; remarkable for combination of B. F. and R. F. technique and for representation of winged Athena. Anzeiger: (1) *Myron's Group of Athena and Marsyas* (J. Sieveking) (cut). (2) *Recent Excavations in Palestine* (H. Thiersch) (19 cuts). (3) *Acquisitions of Louvre, British Museum, Ashmolean, and Boston Museum in 1907*. (4) *Meetings of Berlin arch. Gesellschaft*. (5) *Notices*. (6) *Bibliography*.

Heft 4.

G. Kropatschek, *Pila Muralia* (additional note) (cut). With reference to previous article (1908, p. 79 ff.), rejects Eichhoff's explanation as = Caesar's *verruta*; instances a wooden example found in Hesse; raises question whether they are not German weapons imitating the Roman pila. C. Robert, *'Homeric Bowls,' illustrating Euripides' Phoenissae* (two plates, five cuts). Publishes a bowl at Halle, and compares it with G104 in British Museum. Notes sundry variations from text; the only group exactly corresponding is that of Iokaste and her children, the rest is the fancy of some rope-tricks. G. Lippold, *Polykleitos* (eight cuts). Studies Polycleitan heads, and notes difficulty of distinguishing divine and athletic types; one of the so-called Herakles heads is only a variant of two athlete types. A. Jolles, *Egypto-Mycenaean Ornamental*

Vessels (fifty cuts). Compares Mycenaean gold and silver vases with those depicted in Egyptian wall-paintings; Mycenaean gold *repoussé* ornaments probably adorned rims of vases in imitation of those seen in the paintings. Egyptian treatment of perspective seems to show that figures of animals were placed *inside* the vases; this principle degenerates into the early Italian plates, with figures in the round, and appears in another form in Roman silver work. Anzeiger: (1) *Excavations at Numantia* (A. Schulten) (eight cuts). (2) *Meetings of Berlin arch. Gesellschaft*, March-June, 1908. (3) *Bibliography*.

XXIV. 1909. Heft 1.

J. Sieveking, *The Hermes of Polykleitos* (two plates, seven cuts). With reference to Lippold's article (*supra*), identifies a Polycleitan athlete-head in Boston as a Hermes, and connects it with the Boboli statue. J. Six, *Euphranor* (twelve cuts). Euphranor applies the canon of Polykleitos, but mars the effect by exaggerations; in painting he pays more attention to colour than to composition; his work more dignified than most contemporary art. Assigns to him the Eubouleus-head and the Lysippian Poseidon in the Lateran. A. Hekler, *Hellenistic Bronze Vases from Egypt* (two plates, five cuts). Describes inlaid patera with Nile landscape, and jug of early Ptolemaic date with Isis procession; probably used in that ceremony. Fr. W. von Bissing, *Note on the Preceding Article*. Confirms Hekler's dating. B. Schulz, *The Porta Aurea at Spalato* (three cuts). Discusses the decoration, and attempts reconstruction; composition shows no signs of decadence. Anzeiger: (1) *Gnathia Vases in Reimer Collection at Hamburg* (R. Pagenstecher) (five cuts). (2) *Faliscan Vases in the same* (R. Ballheimer) (three cuts). (3) *Attic Hydria from Melos* (E. Roese) (cut). (4) *Bibliography*. (5) *Obituary Notices of A. Mau and G. Kawerau*. *

H. B. W.

depicted
adorned
tment of
ases; this
ound, and
uations at
7, March-

reference
ston as a
lve cuts).
gerations;
work more
ad and the
vom *Egyed*
ing of early
r. W. von
chulz, *The*
pts recon-
ia *Vases in*
ases in the
ese) (cut).

B. W.